

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION AT NEW ORLEANS

FOR some time it has seemed desirable to hold a meeting of the American Historical Association in the far south. The meetings that are held periodically at Washington are not inconvenient for the members living in the southeastern states, but from the beginning until 1903 no meeting was held in the southern part of the Mississippi Valley within easy reach of members from the south and southwest. The members in this region, it is true, are not many, but nevertheless a meeting that all could attend without trouble would, it was thought, bring together an unusual number and prove helpful to the scholars that are striving to arouse the Southern people to greater interest in history and to a greater appreciation of historical material and historical opportunity. The year 1903 seemed the appropriate time; a meeting at New Orleans would be a suitable recognition of the centennial anniversary of the acquisition of Louisiana. With these various considerations in mind, the Association determined to hold its nineteenth annual meeting at New Orleans. The sessions were held December 29, 30, and 31.

Although there were not in attendance so many Southern members as the most enthusiastic desired to see, there were enough to show the growing interest in historical work; and, while the value of the meeting cannot yet be weighed or measured, there is reason to believe that it gave new courage and zeal to historians and to historical students of the south—not only to teachers and students of history, but also to those who are engaged in gathering historical material and in preserving the manuscript records of the southern states. The number of members from other sections of the Union was not quite so large as at some of the recent meetings, but on

the other hand the attendance was very widely representative of all sections and states. Members were present from California and Arizona beyond the mountains, from Massachusetts and Connecticut in the northeast, from most of the other states of the Atlantic coast, and in unusual numbers from all parts of the Mississippi basin. A special train brought most of the members from the northeast. It started from New York and followed the line of the Southern Railway, offering an opportunity to visit Richmond, Atlanta, Mobile, and other places on the southward journey, and Chattanooga on the return trip. A special car, starting at Chicago for the convenience of the Northern members, stopped on the return trip at Vicksburg. In spite of some delays and the discomforts incident to crowded sleepers, these excursions seem to have been very successful and to have given general satisfaction.

The programme was so arranged as to have an occasional character. Two joint sessions were held with the Economic Association; at the first the regular annual addresses of the presidents were given; at the second the relation of sociology to economics and history was the subject of discussion. The papers of one session related chiefly to the Louisiana purchase; at another session the study and teaching of history in the south was discussed; at other sessions several papers were read bearing directly on the history of the south or the southwest. The only possible fault to be found with the programme was that there was too much of it; and this seems an ungrateful comment to pass on a scheme that was evidently the result of much hard work and serious planning by the members of the committee having the subject in charge. So far as the quality of the papers is concerned, the programme was one of the very best in the history of the Association. But the weary member who had traveled mayhap 1,500 or 2,000 miles to attend the meeting, who was desirous of seeing the sights of the old French city, and was even more anxious to exchange experiences with some fellow-worker whom he had not seen since the meeting at Philadelphia, was in a distracted state when confronted by an excellent programme filled with interesting and profitable papers and so arranged as to leave practically no free time outside of the three daily sessions.

In addition to the attractions of the programme must be mentioned the courteous attentions of the friends of the Association in New Orleans. The local committee of arrangements, of which Professor John R. Ficklen, of Tulane University, was chairman, left nothing undone to care for the comfort and pleasure of the guests. On the first day of the meeting, after a series of appro-

priate papers bearing on Louisiana history, the members were given a Creole luncheon by the Louisiana Historical Society. Wednesday noon a luncheon was served in the refectory of Tulane University, in the evening a smoker was given to men at the Round Table Club, and in the same afternoon Mrs. T. G. Richardson gave a reception especially intended for the lady members of the Association. The president and faculty of Tulane University received the members of the Association Thursday evening in the library of the university. On Friday morning the members of the Association were given a steamboat ride on the Mississippi, in the course of which they stopped to see the site of the battle of New Orleans and to visit a sugar plantation. At the point where Jackson beat back the British, short addresses were made by Professor J. B. McMaster and by the president of the Louisiana Historical Society, Professor Alcée Fortier. At the sugar plantation Professor Fortier spoke entertainingly of the beginning of the planting industry in Louisiana, of how sugar-cane gradually supplanted the indigo crop, and of the old plantation life before the war. The pleasure of the week was enhanced by the hospitality of the Round Table Club, the Athletic Club, and the Boston Club, which opened their club-houses to the use of the members of the Association.

A year ago, at the Philadelphia meeting, a number of persons who were members either of the Historical Association or of the Economic Association met and discussed the advisability of forming an association devoted to the study and discussion of topics in political science. It was then decided to take the matter under advisement and to give it serious consideration. A committee, appointed at Philadelphia to investigate the subject and gather opinions, reported at New Orleans in favor of establishing an organization not affiliated formally with either of the older associations. In accordance with that recommendation, a new society called the American Political Science Association was formed. Its purpose is to advance the study of politics, public law, administration, and diplomacy. There was a general feeling among the men who formed this association that their fields of work were so decidedly different from the fields of economics and history that only by the formation of a separate society could their topics receive proper attention and be sufficiently discussed.

The first session of the Historical Association was held under the auspices of the Louisiana Historical Society at the Cabildo, the picturesque and interesting *hôtel de ville* in the center of the old French quarter. The subjects under consideration all bore more or less directly on the Louisiana purchase. The first paper, by Professor

William M. Sloane, of Columbia University, is given in this number of the REVIEW, under the title "World Aspects of the Louisiana Purchase", presenting in a few words and in an interesting manner the epochal character of the movement and the treaty that gave to the United States the western half of the Mississippi basin. Hon. William Wirt Howe, of New Orleans, read a valuable paper on "The Civil and the Common Law in the Louisiana Purchase." When the colony was first settled, the law of France and the Custom of Paris prevailed, but with the Spaniards naturally came the Spanish system. In 1769 a small treatise containing rules of practice, some rules of criminal law, and directions in regard to wills was promulgated by Governor O'Reilly. From that time the laws of Spain really governed Louisiana; but they were in many respects similar in their origin to the laws of France, and the difference was scarcely perceived. After the cession to the United States, the Louisiana purchase was divided, one portion, about the present area of the state of Louisiana, being set off as the Territory of Orleans. Within these limits the old civil law as codified in 1808, largely along the lines of the Code Napoleon, continued to be fundamental, while in the rest of the purchase, which in 1812 became the Territory of Missouri, the common law of England was naturally introduced by immigration, and in 1816 was adopted by territorial statute as the rule of judicial decision. The two legal systems, however, are not now so diverse as formerly; technicalities have been gradually disappearing, and the elementary principles of right and justice are to-day much the same in all parts of the Louisiana purchase.

A paper on "New Orleans and the Aaron Burr Conspiracy" was read by Dr. Walter F. McCaleb. He referred to Burr's plan for revolutionizing the Spanish colonies; he recounted the formation of the "Mexican Association", the object of which was to obtain information regarding the forces and the internal condition of New Spain. The ordinary notion that the Creole resented the acquisition of Louisiana, Mr. McCaleb said, was altogether unfounded. He described how the idea gained currency that the Spaniards by threatening invasion would gain adherents among the people of New Orleans, and how Wilkinson, with characteristic effrontery and knavishness, announced that New Orleans was a hot-bed of sedition and that Burr was plotting to disrupt the Union, and, while so professing, began to make military arrests and to rule the city with arrogance and injustice. Jefferson himself, under the influence of Wilkinson, came to believe that Burr was engaged in

treasonable undertakings, and that in New Orleans was centered his strength.

The paper of Dr. W. R. Shepherd, of Columbia, on "Louisiana in the Spanish Archives", was in a measure a plea for the examination of Spanish archives as sources of American history. Contrary to the commonly received opinions, the archives of Spain, Mr. Shepherd said, are more accessible than those of other European countries. The only requirements for admission are a good knowledge of Spanish and the proof that the investigator is a responsible person. The dispersion of the materials among several centers and an imperfect classification of the documents themselves are serious obstacles in the way of the investigator, and personal research is indispensable in practically all cases. The three great repositories that contain materials of importance for the history of the United States are those at Simancas, Madrid, and Seville. Among the papers at Simancas are many valuable sources for the study of United States history during the period of the Revolution, but many important documents of this time are to be found also in Madrid and Seville. As to the materials concerning Louisiana more specifically, the archives at Simancas and Madrid supplement each other, but the bulk of them is to be found in Madrid. Here also are the state papers properly so called as distinguished from the correspondence of the colonial officials with the Council of the Indies. This correspondence constitutes the wealth of the Archives of the Indies at Seville and hence are of special value for the internal history of Louisiana.

Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary and superintendent of the Wisconsin Historical Society, told the story of Lewis and Clark's journals. It is popularly supposed that the *Travels* edited by Nicholas Biddle and published at Philadelphia in 1814 are substantially the journals of the two explorers. But Mr. Thwaites showed that the original manuscripts of these journals amounted to over a million words, from which Biddle prepared a condensed popular narrative of 370,000. Practically all of the scientific matter was omitted, as Dr. Benjamin S. Barton had been engaged to make a separate volume of this, but he died without preparing his part. From 1816 to 1818 Thomas Jefferson spent much time in collecting the scattered note-books, which he deposited with the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia, in trust for the public. In 1892-1893 Dr. Elliott Coues made several extracts from these manuscripts, as notes to his reprint edition of Biddle's work; but the manuscripts are, as a whole, as yet unpublished. Recently Mr. Thwaites unearthed in New York, among the Clark heirs, several

additional note-books by William Clark, together with a large mass of other data relative to the expedition. The story, as told by Mr. Thwaites, abounds in interesting details, some of them humorous, but others almost tragic in character.

On Tuesday evening a joint meeting of the two Associations was held at Newcomb Hall. President Edwin A. Alderman, of Tulane University, gave the address of welcome, in the course of which he spoke of the interesting and picturesque character of the history of the city, and of the fundamental tragic fact in the life of the South, the presence of the negro—the all-important economic fact of the present as of the past. For sixty years, he declared, the South stood ready to die and did die for the doctrine of state sovereignty, and to-day it would die for the doctrine of racial integrity: he deprecated, however, the continued discussion of the race question—"the discussion has become a national disease and should be quarantined against, for it is getting hysterical and dangerous." The speaker concluded that people who hold to high political doctrines which do not admit of compromise in their minds gain in a genius for intensity of conviction what they lose in liberalism, and that America needs the intense idealism of the South. Professor E. R. A. Seligman, president of the Economic Association, spoke on "Social Aspects of Economic Law." He said that while everyone is aware that economics is a social science, the theory has received lip-service only and not brain homage. He asked real recognition of the social basis of economic law, and advocated serious application of sound social principle to the solution of the pressing problems of the day. "We are beginning to see", he declared, in referring to the labor problem, "that the securest guaranty of liberty is the social sanction—that true and perfect freedom is at bottom, the outgrowth of social forces, and that individual bargaining results in a mere empty husk of freedom." The speaker dwelt chiefly on the need of a new study of taxation based on the existence of economic law and in accord with actual social facts and forces. "We shall then be able to prove", he said, "that in order to secure justice we do not need to impose a tax which seeks equally to hit in the first instance every individual member of the community." He argued, however, that the proper subordination of the individual does not mean his depreciation or the establishment of the crude socialism that is loudly proclaimed by some as the ideal policy of the future.

The address of Dr. Henry C. Lea, president of the Historical Association, was read by Professor Haskins, as Mr. Lea was unable to be present. It was published in the January number of the

REVIEW and therefore needs no long description here. The reader will remember that Mr. Lea in discussing ethical values in history pronounced as utterly fallacious the notion that there is an absolute and invariable code by which men of all ages and all degrees of civilization can be judged. Standards of right and justice, in part at least, are merely a social product changing with the passing years, and to judge a man's motives and acts by the rigid rule of to-day is to judge unjustly. The historian who would aspire to be a judge must not try a case by a code unknown to the defendant. Mr. Lea considered at some length the career of Philip II. of Spain, declaring that the student in earnest quest of truth may reasonably pause and ask himself whether Philip is to be held morally responsible for all his acts, whether he was a mere bloodthirsty tyrant, rejoicing in the suffering of others, or the conscientious but misguided agent of false standards, believing himself to be rendering the highest service to God. The address, therefore, advocated a calm recital of facts and conditions, the telling of the unadorned tale which because of its truth will not lose its claims as a teacher of the higher morality. The study of the past in this spirit may render us more impatient of the present and more hopeful of the future.

The Wednesday morning session was devoted to a conference on the study and teaching of history in the south. Professor W. E. Dodd, of Randolph-Macon College, spoke of the discouraging conditions in the south, where the teachers are underpaid, the school equipment is meager, and the pupils preparing for college have difficulty in getting proper instruction. He spoke of the rigidity of public opinion and of the fact that a large portion of the people are not accustomed to reading or the use of books. Under the circumstances strenuous effort must be made to awaken the people of the south, who love their own past and take pride in the achievements of their fathers, to an intelligent, sympathetic interest in history and history teaching in the schools and colleges. Professor Alcée Fortier spoke of the curriculum in the New Orleans schools, and referred to the work of the Louisiana Historical Society and to its collections. Miss Lilian W. Johnson, of the University of Tennessee, spoke principally of the work done in the schools and colleges of Tennessee, of the influence of the summer school at Knoxville, and of the spirit of progress that is discernible even though to the impatient the forward movement seems at times hopelessly slow. The difficulties of the situation are heightened by the fact that Tennessee has a debt, a reminder of the days of Reconstruction, and has, moreover, no school fund. The school system must be supported only by direct and immediate taxation.

Professor Frederick W. Moore, of Vanderbilt University, discussed the past rather than the present of historical study. He spoke of the conditions before the war, of the men who had been conspicuous teachers of history in the early days, and of the gradual improvement in recent years. Up to 1860 the north and south were not very unequal in their facilities for historical study; in both sections there was gradual improvement. In the next fifteen years the northern schools and colleges developed their curricula; in the south conditions grew worse. During the last twenty years there has been a rapid growth at the north and slow improvement at the south. Professor Franklin L. Riley, of the University of Mississippi, spoke of the work done in his state for the improvement of historical teaching and study, but dwelt chiefly on the founding of the Mississippi Historical Society and the establishment of the department of archives and history in the state government. Professor David Y. Thomas, of Hendrix College, commented briefly on the situation in Arkansas. Mr. Thomas M. Owen, who is in charge of the newly-created department of archives and history of the state of Alabama, gave a statement of the aid that is now given by the southern states for the preservation, collection, and publication of their records and other historical material. Scarcely any states in the Union are doing as much as are Alabama and Mississippi, where the state governments have established departments charged with the task of gathering and preserving valuable historical papers. Most of the other southern states do not give much direct financial support to historical undertakings, though some of them have made appropriations for the publication of materials. In Texas a small appropriation has been made for the classification and translation of early Texas manuscripts, while the historical association without material financial encouragement from the state has been courageously undertaking the enormous task of bringing together the old records and miscellaneous papers bearing on the early history of the southwest. Professor J. Franklin Jameson, of the University of Chicago, commented briefly on the condition of historical study and teaching in the south, saying that there is every reason to be encouraged by the undoubted evidences of advancement, reminding his hearers that but a few years ago the East had accomplished but little and that the West still faces many of the problems that now confront the South. A single and, if need be, a self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of history, he said, is the surest mode of removing the obstacles to progress. The paper of Professor Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar, was not intended to have peculiar bearing on the problems of the Southern teacher. She

discussed in a most entertaining and suggestive manner the problem of cultivating by historical study the pupil's power of observation. Opportunity for developing this faculty is everywhere abundant and open to every discerning and intelligent teacher. Historical occurrences as well as human aspirations are plainly presented in the place-names of every region of America. The architecture of every land, too, is a solid, permanent record of its stages of civilization and its different phases of human thought; thus, to the observant student of history the evanescent and ephemeral spirit of the passing centuries is seen firmly fastened in the stone, brick, and mortar of private dwellings and public edifices.

The afternoon session of Wednesday was taken up with three papers on European history. Professor F. M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, read a paper entitled "Louis XVI., Machault, and Maurepas", in which he examined the commonly accepted tradition that the king began the series of unfortunate acts that led to his execution by selecting as his adviser the frivolous Maurepas in place of the upright and sober Machault. According to the common story, he had originally decided upon Machault, but, yielding to the influence of his aunt Adelaide, he recalled the messenger and substituted Maurepas for Machault on the envelope. The tradition, Professor Fling declared, is a mere legend, against the probability of which can be cited, not only written evidence, but the historical setting and circumstances of the time. Maurepas was the man that would naturally be chosen as adviser; Machault was an impossibility. The next paper was on "Sermons as a Source of Medieval History", by Professor C. H. Haskins, of Harvard, which will be printed in a succeeding number of the REVIEW. It dwelt chiefly on the sermons preached at Paris in the thirteenth century, which contain much valuable material for the history of medieval culture. They throw light on the every-day life of the time and especially upon university conditions, touching upon various aspects of academic methods and procedure, the character of the studies pursued, and the nature of the examinations. Dr. H. A. Sill, of Cornell University, next spoke on "Plato in Practical Politics." Plato's political theories, Dr. Sill maintained, were intended to lead to practical results. He had purposed in early life to enter public service; the *Republic* was offered as a concrete programme of attainable reform; its more polemical portions were directed against imperialistic democracy as well as against the Tyrannies represented by Dionysius of Syracuse. On the death of Dionysius, Plato was called by the party of reform to Syracuse to give aid in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy and in

freeing the communities subject to Syracuse. The attempt failed, but he still clung to the hope of affecting the policy of the younger Dionysius. He took no active part in the revolution, which resulted in nothing but confusion. *The Laras*, written near the end of Plato's life and designed to present his theories in a form adapted to actual existing conditions, was evidently composed in a spirit of resignation, bearing witness nevertheless to his undying hope that his ideals might find ultimate realization.

The session of Wednesday evening, the third session of a day filled with good papers and interesting discussions, was devoted to diplomatic history. Professor F. J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, read the first paper, which was a valuable summary statement of the relations of Spain, England, and France in the Mississippi basin from 1789 to 1803. In an article which will be printed in an early number of the REVIEW Professor Turner will consider the subject in a somewhat different form and with more detail. It is necessary, therefore, only to say here that the paper dwelt on the significance of the Louisiana purchase, which gave to the United States the undeniable control of the Mississippi basin, and put an end to a long system of intriguing and plotting which had occupied France, Spain, and England for so many years; it recounted briefly the efforts of Spain to secure the western country, the later ambition of France, and the hope of England. The chief value of the paper lies in the fact that it traces in broad outline through the administrations of Washington and Adams the course of diplomatic history; for in the twenty years succeeding the Revolution, as throughout the war itself, diplomatic effort and diplomatic difficulty were intimately associated with the great problem of the west, with American expansion and the occupation of the Mississippi valley, for the possession of which France and England had already fought a long and exhausting war. The paper read by Professor George P. Garrison, of the University of Texas, on the annexation of Texas, will also be published in the REVIEW. The reader will see that though the title is an old one, the treatment is new, that the whole is an important study largely based on hitherto unused documents. Possibly the statement that will attract most attention is that the annexation movement was not brought into being or at first stimulated by pro-slavery influences; that it was the natural product of American growth, of American expansive spirit. The student who has read Western history to any purpose will probably be easily convinced by Professor Garrison's assertions. Dr. Jesse S. Reeves gave an interesting account of the events leading up to the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. He told of the

appointment of Trist as commissioner for this critical negotiation. Trist was a clerk in the State Department, devoid of diplomatic experience and without the diplomatic temperament, but he was thought to be amply qualified to bring to an end Polk's "little war", which was intended to be a lesson to the Mexicans and to furnish an opportunity to get much land as an indemnity for a little trouble. The idea of sending a peace commissioner to accompany the army and seek a favorable opportunity for proposing peace was a very unusual procedure, which may be explained by the coincidence that Santa Anna, having been permitted by Polk to pass into Mexico, had barely arrived at the capital when Polk's overture for peace reached him. Trist succeeded in getting into sundry difficulties with General Scott, in giving untold annoyance to Polk, who wanted California without too much fighting and without any commotion, and finally, in making a treaty, after he was recalled, which was in exact conformity with the letter of his original instructions—a unique and amusing episode in diplomatic history. His correspondence leads one to believe that he did this because he thought that Polk now wanted all of Mexico and that he could throw on Polk the odium of making excessive demands and annihilating Mexico. A generation after these events, this petulant diplomat, who had disregarded the orders of his superior and made a treaty which turned over an empire to his country, was paid by Congress for his successful if forbidden services.

The day's programme was brought to an end by an entertaining talk by Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, who spoke of a collection of valuable manuscripts in his possession—the correspondence and diaries of Baron von Closen of Count de Rochambeau's staff. The papers furnish important material for the study of the social conditions and military incidents of the Revolution. By the use of a stereopticon some of the more interesting letters and a number of original drawings by von Closen were exhibited, among the drawings being a sketch of Martha Washington by Alexander Hamilton.

At the Thursday morning session, which, like all the sessions of the previous day, was held at Tulane University, papers in the general field of American history were read. The paper by Professor Max Farrand, of Leland Stanford, which we have the privilege of publishing in this number of the *REVIEW*, was the first on the programme. In an interesting paper on the Constitutional Convention of 1864 in Louisiana, Professor John R. Ficklen, of Tulane University, described the effort to form a constitution, the problems that were presented to the convention, and especially the difficulty of dealing with negro suffrage. Peculiar interest attaches to the

convention because it was one of the earliest attempts to restore a seceded state to its place in the Union; because it shows what Union men within the Federal lines were willing to do for the negro; because the reconvening of this convention in 1866 is properly regarded as the proximate cause of the severity of Congressional Reconstruction in the south; and lastly, because the scheme devised for the reconstruction of Louisiana was entirely the work of Abraham Lincoln. The result of the convention's work was a constitution containing every provision desired by General Banks, and otherwise mainly a revised edition of the constitution of 1852. It favored the abolition of slavery, and provided for public schools for colored and white children, but did not extend suffrage to the negroes. The convention lasted seventy-eight days, adopted a constitution filling ten pages, and spent during its deliberations \$125,000, of which \$791 was for goblets and wine-glasses, and \$9,421.55 was for liquors and cigars. The next paper on the programme was by Hon. Peter J. Hamilton, of Mobile. It gave an outline of the history of West Florida from 1763 to 1781. The last paper of the morning was on "Popular Sovereignty and the Development of the West", by Professor Allen Johnson, of Iowa College. The paper was substantially a study of Stephen A. Douglas and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The argument was in brief as follows: Neither Douglas nor any other statesman invented the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty". The right of the people to regulate their own domestic concerns was already a part of the political creed of Western democracy. Douglas, always an advocate of territorial expansion, sought to give it wider application in the new territories. He is not, therefore, to be regarded as a tool of the slave power. The Kansas-Nebraska Act was the outcome of repeated efforts through ten years to secure the organization of the Territory of Nebraska. His chief concern was the development of the farther west, so that our Pacific possessions might be brought into vital connection with the commonwealths of the Mississippi valley. The Kansas-Nebraska Act was not planned before the thirty-third Congress as a political coup. Douglas believed that by repealing the Missouri Compromise in favor of the principle of "popular sovereignty" he was making an apparent but not an actual concession to the South. He did not expect that even Kansas would become slave territory.

The last session of the Association was held in connection with the Economic Association, the subject of discussion being the relation of sociology to history and economics. There was much sober statement, considerable assertion, and a good deal of amiable recrimi-

nation. The debate was not without interest, but the residuum of conviction was negligible. The sociologists complained that history is unscientific, if not meaningless. The historian answered that facts are facts, even if sound generalizations are not drawn from them, and they denounced the modern notion that knowledge is not knowledge if it is not obtained, classified, and labeled according to the demands of the student of physical science. The sociologists, the historian suggested, may draw as many conclusions as they see fit and torture facts to suit as many hypotheses as they choose, but they ought not to be deluded into the supposition that their work is historical. The opening paper was by Professor F. H. Giddings, of Columbia, who said that he conceives of sociology as a study of the general forms of social phenomena, and the general causes operative in society; while statistics, history, and ethnography are studies of concrete social relations or occurrences in the present, the recorded past, and the unrecorded development of man before history, properly so called, begins. He developed at some length his conception of sociology as a theory of social causation. Those philosophies of history that are metaphysical were set aside as practically valueless, and those materialistic theories, like Montesquieu's and Buckle's, which try to explain social changes in terms of the direct action of the physical environment upon the human mind, were likewise inadequate. The real key to the explanation of social evolution is found in those characteristics of the physical environment which determine the ethnic and the psychological composition of a population through the processes of migration, including emigration and immigration. In conclusion the speaker called attention to some of the relations of this composition of a people to the possibilities of liberalism and democracy in their social organization. Professor Giddings was followed by Professor Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago, who contended that the historians, in spite of all their rejoicing over a new era, have not as yet found the social viewpoint. They spend all their time in indexing dreary, profitless details about inconsequential folk, in developing their technical skill for the discovery of insignificant objects, in learning so much about how to investigate that they have forgotten what is worth investigation. Professor Charles H. Cooley, of the University of Michigan, in discussing the paper, said that there are three ways of thinking about the nature of history as regards cause and effect, *viz.*, the materialistic, the idealistic, and the organic, that of these the last was the right way, and that it had not been sufficiently emphasized by the speaker. Professor George L. Burr, of Cornell, in a very interesting criticism of Professor Giddings's asser-

tions, contended that the grievance of which Professor Giddings complained is only that the word history has never meant what he would now make it mean. The theme of history has indeed been, not generalizations, but the lives and deeds of individuals—individual men, individual peoples, individual states, individual civilizations; its method has been, not biologic, but biographic; its prime aim, however obscured now and then by the prepossessions, theologic or sociologic, of the historian, has always been, in the simple phrase of Ranke, to learn and to tell *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*. History may possibly not be scientific. It is not the sciences alone that have a right to their names and to their fields. If history is not a science of society, it is more; it is society, it is travel, acquaintance, experience, life. Professor Willis M. West, of the University of Minnesota, in his comments on the paper, remarked on the readiness of the sociologists to rush in where historians decline to spin cobwebs. The historian, in close touch with complex facts, denies the possibility of capping social life with a formula. The sociologist, with commendable confidence, calls out, "Then bring me your facts and I will tell you what they mean." But there will be no such quaint division of labor. So far as history can be explained, the historian means to explain it himself; and he feels as competent to do so as anyone can be who does not study it. The remarks of Professor Emerton, of Harvard, were in substantial accord with the arguments of the other historians. "I cannot help thinking", he said in conclusion, "that under the seductive name of sociology we are here meeting once more the ghost of our ancient enemy, the philosophy of history. I am far from denying that there is a great variety of human facts that can be studied in themselves and in their manifold relations with much profit to our day, and in so far as it is the work of sociologists to gather and marshal these facts in usable form, it is worth while to enrich our vocabulary by this one more word of classification. But if sociology is to spend its energies in concocting schemes of philosophy to explain the past and in ever so slight a degree to predict the future, then the sooner it is resolved into its constituent parts and dropped from the schedules of our institutions of learning, the better." Dr. Lester F. Ward, of the Smithsonian Institution, said that the difference between sociology and history is that sociology is science, while history is not. Sociology is based on a train of causation; history on a train of facts. History he declared to be an agreeable occupation and a pleasant pastime.

The business meeting of the Association, which was held Thursday afternoon, was as usual not the least interesting of the sessions.

Dr. James Ford Rhodes presided. The corresponding secretary, Professor Haskins, gave the report of the Council, spoke generally of the business that had been transacted, and said that the Council had decided that in the future the members of the Association should be consulted more generally than in the past concerning the election of officers, and that blanks would be sent out, upon which members might suggest their choices for officers and make any other suggestions concerning the work of the Association. Following a recommendation of the Council, the Association voted to discontinue the Church History Section; the reason for this step is simply that the work of the Association is so broad and inclusive that there is no need of separating church history and distinguishing it from other fields of historical study. This action was in accord with a report made by a committee composed of Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson, Professor George P. Fisher, and Professor William A. Dunning, who had been asked by the Council in 1902 to get the opinions of members interested in church history, consider the question of the continuance of the section, and investigate the advisability of taking such action. Dr. Bowen, the treasurer, in giving his report for the year, was enabled to say that in spite of increasing expenses, the funds of the Association had grown during the year. The total receipts were \$7,204.02 and the net gain \$736.49. The number of members on the rolls last year was 2,070. The assets of the Association now amount to something over \$21,000.

The most interesting and significant new departure was the establishment of a Pacific Coast Branch of the Association. The constitution of this new organization and the terms of its relationship to the general organization are simple. Members of the American Historical Association residing in states wholly or in part west of the Rocky Mountains may, if they so desire, be enrolled as members of the Pacific Branch; other persons desiring membership may become members, if approved by the executive committee, by paying the ordinary dues to the treasurer of the general Association. The president of the Pacific Branch or a delegate is entitled to attend the meetings of the Executive Council of the American Historical Association, from whose treasury is to be paid a reasonable sum for clerical expenses of the yearly meetings of the Pacific Branch. An account of these meetings and the papers deemed suitable for inclusion in the *Reports* of the Association are entitled to be printed.

Professor E. G. Bourne, chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, in reporting on its work, called attention to the recent publication of the Chase Papers. In the near future the commission

will present for printing the despatches of the French ministers in this country between 1795 and 1798, something over 350,000 words in all, throwing much light on the diplomatic history of the period. They are to be edited by Professor F. J. Turner. In addition the commission has in contemplation the publication of documents bearing on the diplomatic history of the Republic of Texas, some 15,000 manuscript pages, opening up the important and interesting history of the relations of Texas with the United States, Great Britain, and France. The editorial work is in the hands of Professor George P. Garrison. The commission, Mr. Bourne reported, are planning to print and distribute a short set of rules or instructions for the transcription and publication of historical manuscripts. For the Public Archives Commission, its chairman, Professor Herman V. Ames, reported considerable progress during the past year. The field of investigation is now so extended that the commission is represented in nearly three-fourths of the states. It is expected that the publications of the Association for 1903 will contain reports from at least six states—Rhode Island, New Jersey, Virginia, Georgia, Texas, and Colorado. In addition to their other work, representatives of the commission have taken the initiative in securing legislation for the better supervision of the archives of Pennsylvania and have begun work for a similar purpose in New York. For the board of editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* Professor George B. Adams spoke chiefly of the fact that the office of the managing editor of the *REVIEW* is now in Washington. Professor A. C. McLaughlin, in supplementing the report of Professor Adams, gave a short statement concerning the relationship of the *REVIEW* to the Carnegie Institution, saying that while there is no definite agreement, the indefinite understanding is that the managing editor of the *REVIEW* will be the director of the Bureau of Historical Research established by the trustees of the Carnegie Institution. He also referred to the contemplated work of the Bureau of Research, reference to which is made on another page of this issue. The committee on the Justin Winsor Prize reported through its acting chairman, Professor Charles H. Hull, of Cornell, that the prize for the year 1903 had been awarded to Dr. Louise Phelps Kellogg, of Madison, Wisconsin, for a monograph on "The American Colonial Charter: a Study of its Relation to English Administration." Following the recommendation of the committee, the Association voted to offer a prize for the best essay on European history, the sum awarded to be charged to the Adams fund, and the prize to be called the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize. Resolutions were passed thanking the hosts of the Association in New Orleans for their courtesies.

The life and services of General Edward McCrady, who held at the time of his death the office of second vice-president in the Association, were appropriately recognized in resolutions of sorrow and respect. The Association voted to meet next year in Chicago and expressed its expectation of meeting in 1905 at Baltimore and Washington, and in 1906 at Providence. The committee on nominations, composed of Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, Professor J. A. James, and Professor J. M. Vincent, proposed a list of officers, who were then chosen by the Association. Dr. Goldwin Smith was made president; Professor John Bach McMaster, first vice-president; Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor Charles H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were once more elected to the positions they had previously held. To the Council were chosen Professor Edward G. Bourne and Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin in place of Professor J. Franklin Jameson and Professor A. Lawrence Lowell, who had served three years as members of the Council.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Goldwin Smith, Esq., Toronto, Canada.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Professor John Bach McMaster, Philadelphia.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, New Haven, Conn.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smith- sonian Institution, Washing- ton.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence Winthrop Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton St., New York.
<i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to above named officers):	
Hon. Andrew Dickson White, ¹	Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, ¹
President James Burrill Angell, ¹	Henry Charles Lea, Esq., ¹
Henry Adams, Esq., ¹	Herbert Putnam, Esq.,
Hon. George Frisbie Hoar, ¹	Prof. Frederick Jackson Turner,
James Schouler, Esq., ¹	Professor George Lincoln Burr,
Professor George Park Fisher, ¹	Prof. Edward Potts Cheyney,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., ¹	Prof. Edward Gaylord Bourne,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., ¹	Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin.

Committees:

Finance Committee: Elbridge T. Gerry, Esq., 261 Broadway, New York, chairman, George S. Bowdoin, Esq.

Committee on Programme for the Twentieth Meeting: Professor J. Franklin Jameson, University of Chicago, chairman, Professors Henry E. Bourne, Ralph C. H. Catterall, Charles H. Haskins, and Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.

Local Committee for the Twentieth Meeting: Charles L. Hutchinson, Esq., Chicago, chairman, Edward E. Ayer, Esq., E. W. Blatchford, Esq., Edward O. Brown, Esq., James H. Eckels, Esq., Dr. James W. Fertig, Marshall Field, Esq., Charles F. Gunther, Esq., President William R. Harper, Dr. Franklin H. Head, H. N. Higinbotham, Esq., Professor James A. James, Professor J. Franklin Jameson, Professor Harry P. Judson, Elbridge G. Keith, Esq., Samuel H. Kerfoot, Jr., Esq., Hermann H. Kohlsaat, Esq., General J. B. Leake, Franklin MacVeagh, Esq., E. E. Prussing, Esq., Martin A. Ryerson, Esq., Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, Professor Francis W. Shepardson, Professor Edwin E. Sparks, Professor Benjamin S. Terry, Dr. James Westfall Thompson, and Dr. Joseph P. Warren (with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman).

Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Twentieth Meeting: Mrs. Mary J. Wilmarth, Auditorium Annex, Chicago, chairman, Miss Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge, Miss Ida M. Tarbell (with power to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

Editors of The American Historical Review: Professors Andrew C. McLaughlin, H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, and Albert Bushnell Hart.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Professor Edward G. Bourne, Yale University, chairman, Professor Frederick W. Moore, Professor Theodore C. Smith, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Professor George P. Garrison, and Worthington C. Ford, Esq.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr College, chairman, Professors Edward P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, Williston Walker, and Roger Foster, Esq. (In Professor Andrews's absence during a portion of the year Professor Hull, Cornell University, will act as chairman of the committee.)

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman, Professors George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, and John Martin Vincent.

Public Archives Commission: Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman, Professors William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, and Edwin E. Sparks.

Committee on Bibliography: Ernest C. Richardson, Esq., Princeton University, chairman, A. P. C. Griffin, Esq., George Iles, Esq., William C. Lane, Esq., Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor Max Farrand.

Committee on Publications: Professor George W. Knight, Ohio State University, chairman, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professors Fred M. Fling, Samuel M. Jackson, Elizabeth K. Kendall, Anson D. Morse, and Earle W. Dow.

General Committee: Professor Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, chairman, Professors Lucy M. Salmon, Lilian W. Johnson, George E. Howard, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, George B. Adams, Charles H. Haskins, and Marshall S. Brown.

JEAN RIBAUT AND QUEEN ELIZABETH

WITH the approach of the centenary celebration of the Louisiana purchase the mind reverts to the first French colony within the present limits of the United States, a colony which, owing to the utter want of foresight and practical experience on the part of its leaders, was attended with lamentable failure. But the men who planted it, though unfitted for colonial ventures, were full of daring and enterprise, and it may not be without interest to clear up an obscure period in the life of its founder, the Huguenot Jean Ribaut, a typical character of that period when France was distracted with internecine wars, and the men trained in its school were ready for every species of adventure.

In the year 1562 Jean Ribaut, having established a settlement at Port Royal, in South Carolina, sailed away for France, in the expectation of returning in the course of a few months with supplies and reinforcements for the small body of men he had left there. The date of his arrival in France, at the end of July of the same year, was a most unpropitious moment for the future of his little colony. Civil war, fomented by England and Spain, each ostensibly in the interest of religion, was raging between the Catholic and Huguenot parties, and the unity of his country was in imminent danger. Coligny, the original promoter of the colonial scheme, was immersed in the fratricidal struggle, and could give Ribaut and his enterprise but passing attention, and so the settlement at Charlesfort was left to its fate. Ribaut is said to have taken an active part in the war, and at the conclusion of the peace of Amboise, which was signed in March, 1563, betook himself to England, where in the summer of the same year he published the results of his Florida expedition. The histories tell us that he there offered his services to Elizabeth, but give no additional details. What actually occurred, so far as it can be gathered from the correspondence of the Spanish ambassadors at the English court, is somewhat remarkable.

Ribaut did not confine himself to the arts of peace alone, for the experience and knowledge he had acquired in Florida were more than sufficient to secure him a ready admission into the circle of adventurers who were just beginning to display their activity and to lay the foundations of the English navy. It is evident that he had in no wise become discouraged at Coligny's failure for the time

being to assist the colony in Florida and was seeking eagerly about him for resources to further the enterprise. Through what channel his presence in England became known to Queen Elizabeth we have no present means of knowing, but it seems probable that he could have been but a short time in the country before he obtained an audience with the queen. Ribaut set before her the importance and wealth of Florida, and urged her to assist him in its conquest. Elizabeth, after listening to his relation, began to refuse him her immediate help, "so that if Philip should complain she would be able to swear that nothing had been done by her order", although her official relations with Spain at the time were not of the most friendly nature. However, she urged Ribaut to undertake the adventure himself, promised him half of all that he found, and added that even were the country not so good as she had been told, it was on the way of the ships from New Spain, Peru, and elsewhere, which Ribaut could safely seize.¹ But the temptation proved too great to be long withstood even by Elizabeth's tender conscience, and she ended by offering him a pension of 300 ducats and a house as an inducement to undertake the discovery. At a later period, when the incident was closed, Ribaut disclaimed ever having accepted the bribe.²

However this may be, it appears that in May, 1563, the notorious Thomas Stukely was arming a fleet of five vessels, to which Ribaut had contributed one and Elizabeth another. The crew was 300 strong, and the fleet, which was well equipped with supplies, ammunition, and artillery, flew the royal standard presented by the queen herself. There were three French pilots aboard, who had previously accompanied Ribaut to Florida. Quadra, Philip's ambassador in London, was himself inclined to attach some credit to the current rumor that it was designed to attack Florida; but it was also said that its object was to assail the Spanish vessels returning from the Indies.³

Stukely, who had sought and obtained an interview with the ambassador, gave Quadra to understand that he was urged on in the undertaking by the government, but for all that Quadra was not wholly disposed to trust his revelations. Stukely then became most

¹ Silva relates this on the authority of Stukely; see Guzman de Silva to Philip II., London, October 22, 1565, in *Correspondencia de Felipe II. con sus Embajadores en la Corte de Inglaterra, 1558 á 1584*, II. 214. English translation in *Spanish State Papers 1558-1567*, I. Elizabeth, 495.

² Quadra to Philip II., London, June 26, 1563, *Correspondencia de Felipe II.*, I. 527; see also Guzman de Silva to Philip II., London, March 30, 1566, *ibid.*, II. 292, English translation in *Spanish State Papers 1558-1567*, I. Elizabeth, 536.

³ Quadra to Philip II., London, May 1, 1563, *Correspondencia de Felipe II.*, I. 512; same to same, June 19, 1563, *ibid.*, 524. English translations of these letters in *Spanish State Papers 1558-1567*, I. Elizabeth, 322, 334.

profuse in his protestations of friendship for Spain, telling Quadra that he was leaving England dissatisfied and desperate, but with the intention of going into the service of Philip, and that he had risked all of his property in the enterprise. He requested Quadra that on his arrival in any Spanish port or elsewhere in Spanish possessions he should be recognized as a servant of the king. Quadra met his advances with caution, and replied that the thing was impossible, given the friendly relations existing between England and Spain, unless his destination were for parts not included within the Spanish lines of demarcation. And at last the true object of the expedition became apparent, as well as the importance of the part that Ribaut was expected to play, for Stukely answered that no one had visited the country where he was going, except a few Frenchmen a short time before, and that it was but three days distant from Cuba. Quadra then told him roundly that in such case the thing was an impossibility, because the land fell within the lines of demarcation. But Quadra's suspicions were not allayed by Stukely's apparent frankness, which he regarded as merely a cunning device on his part for safeguarding the expedition from Spanish attack. In the letter relating these circumstances, which he wrote to Philip II., he expressed his opinion that the enterprise was really due to French as well as English intrigue, adding, "I have no assurance that he carries a commission; it seems to me that his project is a result of the determination . . . reached by the Admiral of France [Coligny] and of those who govern here to harass that commerce [of the Indies] and to conquer Your Majesty on the Ocean Sea." "I expect to talk about it to the queen", he continues, "although I know what answer she will make me, which is the same answer she has given me on former occasions, and which she has also written me."¹ A week later Quadra wrote that not only was the fleet destined for Florida, but for the very spot where Ribaut had founded his colony, and that Ribaut had promised to turn over to Stukely, together with its small garrison, the fort that he had built there.

The affair was brought to a sudden and most unexpected termination, as far as Ribaut was concerned, by the discovery that he and the three French pilots had planned to escape to France with the ships and hostages. The outcome of it was that Ribaut was seized, thrown into prison, and threatened with hanging, while the three pilots were put into chains and kept to conduct Stukely's fleet.²

In the light of contemporary events it is permissible to doubt whether Ribaut had at any time intended to betray the Florida colony

¹ Quadra to Philip II., June 19, 1563, *Correspondencia*, I. 524; *Spanish State Papers 1558-1567*, I. Elizabeth, 334.

² Quadra to Philip II., June 26, 1563, *Correspondencia*, I. 527.

into English hands. Havre was still occupied by the English, and it was only on July 29 of this very year that it was finally returned to France after fierce fighting under its walls and after the plague had decimated its English garrison; and Calais, which Elizabeth was most anxious to recover, was still held by the French. Ribaut was a brave, cool, and determined man, as subsequent events proved, and moreover he was a Frenchman; which means that he loved his native soil with the devotion that preëminently distinguishes his race and has made of it the most home-loving of people. This dramatic incident in Ribaut's career occupied less than two months, and it may well be supposed that the hardy Dieppois, who, like the French of to-day, probably looked upon all foreigners as barbarians, was not at all averse to practising a clever trick on Stukely and his English queen, and had entered into his engagements at the very outset with this end in view.

Whether he was released from his English prison or managed to make his escape we do not know. There is good reason to believe that he was still in confinement at the date of the sailing of the second expedition, under Laudonnière, on April 22 of the following year,¹ but he was back again in France in time to head the fleet that sailed in May of 1565 to the relief of the ill-fated colony in Florida, where he suffered the death of a brave man with the fortitude of a Christian.

When some two years later Philip notified Elizabeth of his indisputable rights to Florida, the French aggressions there, and the chastisement he had inflicted upon them, the crafty queen did not forget her caution. She congratulated Philip on his success, and bade de Silva convey her thanks to his king for having advised her of the event. At the same time Elizabeth expressed her surprise at learning that Florida had been discovered and occupied by Spain. In her ignorance of Philip's right, "she had always believed that Captain Ribaut had been the first to have discovered it; for he had come to her with the news of its discovery, and she had determined to send to conquer it herself", and she concluded by asking Philip's pardon for what she had done.² The incident establishes beyond doubt that Stukely was merely the instrument of Elizabeth in carrying out her serious designs to occupy Florida, and that the rumor of such an intention was not a mere blind given out to conceal an ulterior object of preying upon the Spanish fleets, as some have supposed.³

WOODBURY LOWERY.

¹ Stefano de Rojomonte in his deposition states that Ribaut was still in prison at the date of sailing of the second expedition in April, 1564. See *Noticias de la población que habían hechos los Francés en la Florida*, Archivo General de las Indias, Seville, MS. Patronato, Estante I; Cajon I; Legajo 19; Ramo 14.

² Silva to Philip II., March 30, 1566, *Correspondencia*, II. 292.

³ See *The School of Shakspeare*, by Richard Simpson, London, 1878, I. 32, *et seq.*

FREDERICK THE GREAT AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

IN attempting to arrive at a conclusion upon the much-debated subject of the attitude of Frederick the Great toward the American Revolution, the reader should constantly bear in mind two important facts about which there is no room for dispute.¹ One of these facts is that Frederick entertained an intense hatred for England, and was consequently glad to see her humiliated; the other, that his interests were such that he was unwilling openly to become her enemy. His hatred dated from the year 1761. Up to that time the English government, under the leadership of Pitt, whose policy was to "conquer America in Germany", had for some years supported him in his unequal contest against his allied enemies by undertaking the defense of his western frontier against the French and by furnishing him an annual subsidy of about £700,000. But in 1761 the Great Commoner was driven out of office; the Tory party, led by the Scotch favorite, the Earl of Bute, seized the reins of power, and at once proceeded in a most treacherous manner to desert their hard-pressed ally by making terms with France. This was an action that Frederick never forgave, and thereafter he entertained toward England, and particularly toward the party in

¹ The most useful source in determining Frederick's attitude is the voluminous correspondence between him and his ministers at home and abroad. This correspondence, in which Frederick expressed himself without reserve, is accessible in the archives at Berlin and in transcript form in the Bancroft Papers in the Lenox Library, New York city; yet, strange to say, no American writer, save Bancroft himself, seems to have made use of it. Many of the others who have felt called upon to discuss the subject have been content to glean their arguments from secondary sources, while a few have consulted the diplomatic correspondence of the Revolutionary period in the editions of Sparks or Wharton. Unfortunately, even Bancroft did his work under circumstances that rendered it difficult for him to be impartial. At the time he wrote his chapter on "The Relations of Two New Powers" (Vol. X., original edition, 1874) he was our representative at the court of Berlin, and was, there is reason to think, somewhat carried away by his enthusiasm for the new German Empire. Consequently he wrote in such a way as to cause certain writers, among them M. Henri Doniol, author of the monumental work *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis*, to regard him as "the inventor of the gratitude due from America to Germany". Adolphe de Circourt, *Histoire de l'Action Commune de la France et de l'Amérique pour l'Indépendance des États-Unis*, Paris, 1876, Volume III., contains some of these letters. The subject is also discussed in Friedrich Kapp, *Friedrich der Grosse und die Vereinigten Staaten von America*, Leipzig, 1871. A review of the facts with quotations from the correspondence seems, however, worth while.

power, the most bitter resentment. Nor was this feeling lessened in intensity when about a decade later, at the time of the first partition of Poland, the British intrigued to prevent him from acquiring Danzig.

Frederick's writings are full of passages in which he vents his hatred toward his former ally. In his *Memoirs after the Peace* occurs the following: "The King of Prussia had more cause for complaint than all the rest [of the European powers]. He had to reproach the English monarch with the peace he had concluded with France, by which England had abandoned Prussia, and with all the arts that had been used to dispossess him of the port of Danzig."¹ He frequently expressed his hostility elsewhere.² "My indifference for this latter power" [England], he said at one time, "can surprise nobody: 'a scalded cat dreads cold water', says the proverb; and, in fact, what union could be contracted with this crown after the signal experience I have had of its duplicity? If it would give me all the millions possible, I would not furnish it two small files of my troops."³ In the same strain he wrote on January 20, 1778: "Meanwhile, I do not wish to dissimulate to you, for however much England may attempt to ally herself with me, I will never consent. I cannot be won over with money as so many other German princes have been. My unalterable determination is not to contract an alliance with a power which has deceived me so infamously as did England in the last war."

Against Bute, whom he blamed as the author of the desertion, and whom he believed, though wrongly, as we know to-day, to be still the power behind the English king and ministry, Frederick entertained the most intense personal bitterness. "The Scotch earl Bute", he wrote, "governed the king and the kingdom. Resembling those malignant spirits of which we continually speak, but which we never see, he concealed both himself and his operations in deep darkness. His emissaries, his creatures, were the engines by which he moved the political machine, according to his will. His system of politics was that of the old Tories, who maintained that the happiness of England required that the king should enjoy despotic power."⁴

¹ Frederick's *Works* (Holcroft's translation), IV. 179.

² See, for example, letters to Baron de Maltzan, his minister to England, January 3, 1774; November 6, 1775; March 31, 1777, in *Circourt*, III. 162, 179, 208.

³ Frederick to de Maltzan, April 7, 1777, *ibid.*, 209. When not otherwise stated, the reference is to the Bancroft Papers. When the date and the names of writer and recipient are given, no note is attached if the letter is in the Bancroft Papers, unless attention is called to it as being also in Sparks or Wharton. Most of the letters referred to as being in Sparks and Wharton are also in the Bancroft Papers.

⁴ *Works*, IV. 172. See for a humorous expression of his hatred for Bute a letter

But though Frederick hated England, and especially the party that ruled her, he did not wish to go to war with her. Although the first soldier of his age, Frederick wished peace. His concern was for Prussia; and since the dark and stormy days of the Seven Years' War, when his kingdom had come so near to shipwreck, he had grown cautious. He knew that young Emperor Joseph II. was full of ambitious schemes for the aggrandizement of Austria and for the humiliation of Prussia, and he was too wise a ruler to further the aims of his enemies by allowing personal prejudice to lead him into open hostility to such a formidable power as England. This attitude is unmistakably revealed in a passage in his *Memoirs after the Peace*. "This", wrote he regarding his refusal to allow the passage across his dominions of German troops hired by England, "was taking but a feeble revenge for the evil proceedings relative to the port of Danzig; neither did the king desire to come to extremities. Long experience had taught him that a multitude of enemies are found in the world, and that we ought not in sport to raise up foes."¹

In view of Frederick's hatred of England, it was but natural that he should be interested in her troubles with the colonies. As early as June 27, 1774, we find him writing to de Maltzan that he was "curious to see the end of the Bostonian heroism",² and that he wished de Maltzan to pay attention to the quarrel in order to keep him well-informed. Later he said that the colonies were evidently firmly resolved to sustain their liberties and that he disapproved of the English policy.³ Still later he expressed the opinion that it was a hundred to one that regulars would be able to beat militia, but that the colonies would doubtless be able to make British commerce and manufactures suffer greatly, and that Parliament might one day regret having pushed things so far.⁴ His judgment upon the policy adopted toward the colonies was spoken in no uncertain terms. "The treatment which the colonies are experiencing", he wrote on September 11, 1775, "appears to me to be the first step toward despotism; and if Lord Bute succeeds in it, the mother-country will likewise have her turn, and they will attempt to subjugate her and to lay down the law to her as they are laying it down to the colonies."⁵

to de Maltzan, November 17, 1777. In another letter, dated Dec. 18, 1777, he wrote, "Quand les Bretons un Lord Bute pendront, Lors leurs guerres par tout prosperont."

¹ *Works*, IV. 178.

² *Circourt*, III. 162.

³ Frederick to de Maltzan, November 14, 1774, *ibid.*, 163.

⁴ Frederick to de Maltzan, February 6 and May 1, 1775, *ibid.*, 168, 172.

⁵ Frederick to de Maltzan September 11, 1775, *ibid.*, 176.

But, though he disapproved of the English policy, he felt that the matter was one in which he was not directly concerned. On February 27, 1775, he said that he did not intend to meddle in the quarrel, but a week later he expressed satisfaction over the fact that the more confused the English affairs became, the less there would be to apprehend for the peace of Europe.¹ In the following June he declared that he would continue to be a "tranquil spectator", and would "await the *dénouement* of the scene with indifference."² The first suggestion made to Frederick that he should form a connection with the Americans appears to have come from de Maltzan, who had been approached by an American agent in London.³ De Maltzan proposed that the king should open commercial relations with the Americans; but Frederick replied: "What you add concerning the establishment of a direct commerce appears to me, considering the actual relations between my state and America, still very problematical. Of all the merchandise in exchange, Virginia tobacco would be the principal article. But without a navy how do you expect me to protect such a commerce or make it respected?"⁴ A month later he expressed himself again in much the same terms.⁵

In the following November a more direct overture was made to the Prussian monarch. In that month William Carmichael was sent by Silas Deane, then agent of the colonies in Paris, to Berlin to make proposals of a commercial nature.⁶ Carmichael accomplished nothing of importance. He explained the character of American products to the Prussian authorities, but found Frederick unwilling to undertake a direct commerce, though he expressed himself willing to exchange commodities through the ports of France.⁷ The next attempt at an understanding was made by the three American commissioners, Deane, Franklin, and Lee, who, in pursuance of the so-called "militia" diplomatic policy, on February 14, 1777, transmitted to the Prussian court copies of the Declaration of Independence and of the Articles of Confederation, and in a letter expressed a desire to obtain Frederick's friendship and to lay before him a plan for commercial intercourse.⁸

¹ Frederick to de Maltzan, February 27 and March 6, 1775, *ibid.*, 170, 171.

² Frederick to de Maltzan, June 29, 1775, *ibid.*, 173.

³ De Maltzan to Frederick, May 21, 1776.

⁴ Frederick to de Maltzan, June 3, 1776, Circourt, III. 195.

⁵ Frederick to de Maltzan, July 1, 1776, *ibid.*, 196.

⁶ Deane to the Committee of Secret Correspondence, Oct. 1, Dec. 3, 1776; Carmichael to the same, Nov. 2, 1776; in Sparks and Wharton; Barnier to Eden, Dec. 14, 21, 1776.

⁷ Schulenburg to Frederick, November 30 and December 2, 1776; Frederick to Goltz, December 2, 1776.

⁸ Circourt, III. 6.

Concerning the proposals made in this letter Frederick wrote from Potsdam to Baron Schulenburg, his minister of state, expressing to him the opinion that since Prussia was without a navy to protect such a commerce, it would be necessary to make use of a foreign flag. But he added:

However, in spite of these considerations, I do not wish to disoblige nor to offend the colonies by a complete refusal of the propositions of their plenipotentiary commissioners at Paris, and it appears to me to be more expedient for you by a civil answer to attempt to keep them in the friendly disposition they appear to entertain towards us. . . In this way the above-mentioned colonies will not be offended, and we shall have the means of entering into negotiations with them should circumstances become more favorable. Then our Silesian linens, our woollens, and other manufactured articles can find a new market. . . All that I recommend to you, then, is to put nothing into your answer to the said plenipotentiaries that can displease or offend their employers, but explain your position toward their offer as favorably as possible, so that the moment events become more propitious there we may be able to take advantage of it.¹

From this and other extracts already quoted it is easy to see that Frederick's policy was, outwardly at least, to maintain a strict neutrality; for, although he was quite willing to see England humiliated, his interests dictated that he should not become embroiled in a war with her. In pursuance of this policy it was impossible for him to fall in with the proposals of the colonists, yet at the same time he wished to avoid offending them, for he hoped thereby to keep a way for opening a profitable commerce with them in case they should prove successful.

On March 15 Schulenburg wrote to the commissioners and stated something of Frederick's position. On the nineteenth of the following month the commissioners again wrote a letter in which they informed Schulenburg that an accredited minister would be sent to Berlin "properly empowered to treat upon affairs of importance", and that in order to hasten the establishment of a commerce, one of their own number would shortly visit the Prussian court. The plan did not meet the approval of Frederick, so he wrote to Schulenburg that the colonies were "in too much of a hurry with their propositions for a formal negotiation", and restated the position he had taken in his letter of March 12.² Schulenburg, therefore, wrote to Arthur Lee, the commissioner chosen to undertake the mission,³ in order to discourage him from coming to Berlin.⁴ But since Lee journeyed by way of Vienna, it would seem that the letter

¹ Frederick to Schulenburg, March 12, 1777. See also Kapp, 22-23.

² Frederick to Schulenburg, May 6, 1777, *Circourt*, III. 89.

³ Arthur Lee to Schulenburg, May 8, 1777, in *Sparks and Wharton*.

⁴ Schulenburg to Arthur Lee, May 20, 1777, in *Sparks and Wharton*.

did not reach him until after his departure from Paris, and perhaps not until his arrival at Berlin.

When Lee reached Berlin, he announced his presence there in a short note to Schulenburg.¹ Two days later he wrote a longer letter in which he discussed the advantages that would result from commercial relations, and also said, "If I had known His Majesty's pleasure before my departure, I should have acted in conformity with it. And if my residence here should give the least uneasiness to your court, I rely upon your excellency's informing me of it." Schulenburg replied that his residence at Berlin would not be at all disagreeable to the king, provided Lee lived as an individual and without assuming a public character. In the same letter he asked for "a memorandum of places where insurance can be effected on vessels destined for America, and the premium of insurance to be paid."² Next day Lee sent the desired information, and added that if the powers of Europe would but open their ports to American war vessels, the problem of commerce would be solved, for then convoys could be fitted out to protect the vessels engaged in it.³ Schulenburg admitted that a commerce between the two countries would probably be profitable, but said that on account of the scantiness of the Prussian merchant marine an effort would have to be made to get the owners of vessels in Holland and Hamburg to carry the goods.⁴ Of course Lee was very far from being content with this answer, for he realized that such a commerce would be of very little importance, and his great aim was to get the Prussian king to commit himself on the side of the Americans. Accordingly, he informed Schulenburg that since the American merchant vessels were also privateers, the only possible way to establish a commerce "hither in the commodities and vessels of the States" would be to open the Prussian ports to the privateers.⁵ Schulenburg replied, however, that while the king was well disposed towards the Americans, he could not afford to embroil himself with the court of London. "Moreover," said he, "our ports have hitherto received only merchant vessels, and no ships of war nor privateers have ever entered there, so that the officers stationed at our ports would be embarrassed how to conduct themselves on such an occasion." Before a final answer could be given, it would be necessary to ascertain the attitude taken by France and Spain concerning the reception of privateers.⁶

¹ A. Lee to Schulenburg, June 5, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

² Schulenburg to A. Lee, June 9, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

³ A. Lee to Schulenburg, June 10, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁴ Schulenburg to A. Lee, June 18, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁵ A. Lee to Schulenburg, June 20, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁶ Schulenburg to A. Lee, June 26, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

In these negotiations Schulenburg was but the mouthpiece of his master, and from the latter's instructions to the minister and from his other correspondence it is not difficult to determine Frederick's attitude. On June 23 he had written from Potsdam to Schulenburg in Berlin, "It is necessary to continue the same tone with him and to tell him that although I am well disposed toward his constituents, he will himself feel that they ought not to expect that in order to favor them I should embroil myself with England."¹ Frederick was, in fact, playing a waiting game. To his brother, Prince Henry, he had written about a week earlier, "I purpose to draw out this negotiation in order to fall in with the side for which Fortune shall declare herself." In a similar strain he had written to Baron Goltz, his minister to France: "As to the deputies of the Congress, I still hesitate as to the course to take toward them. It is necessary to await the turn in their affairs."² To de Maltzan at London he wrote, "There has arrived at my court a deputy of the colonies to propose to me a commercial treaty; but as their independence is not yet decided, you will readily see that I have not wished to enter into negotiations with him."³ At that time, with the outcome of the expeditions of Howe and Burgoyne uncertain, the prospects of the colonies were not very bright, and consequently Frederick was more than usually unwilling to do in their behalf anything that would bring upon him the resentment of England. At the same time, however, he wished to avoid offending the colonies, for he foresaw that the time might come when it would be desirable to have a way open for a commercial connection. Because of his dislike for England he naturally inclined to wish that the colonies would prove successful; but, as he many times wrote, the whole matter was really indifferent to him.

The negotiations were now complicated by an extraordinary episode. The English minister, Hugh Elliot, a man whom Finckenstein characterized as "very young and very rash",⁴ had naturally taken great interest in the presence of Lee in Berlin. As a result of this interest a servant of the English embassy entered Lee's lodgings, broke open his desk, and stole his papers. By some writers it has been asserted that the English minister directly instigated this remarkable robbery, and Bancroft states that the robber was hired for 1,000 guineas.⁵ Such may have been the case. Years afterward, however, Elliot assured John Quincy Adams upon his word of honor that the servant acted without express orders and merely out of the

¹ Circourt, III. 95.

² Frederick to Goltz, June 7, 1777, *ibid.*, 92.

³ Frederick to de Maltzan, June 23, 1777, *ibid.*, 94.

⁴ Finckenstein to Schulenburg, June 28, 1777.

⁵ Bancroft, IX. 174 (original edition, 1866).

knowledge that Elliot was curious to know what headway Lee was making in his negotiations.¹ However this may have been, there is no question that, the papers once obtained, Elliot was not above looking them over. Copies of them were taken, after which the originals were left on Lee's staircase, while the servant was spirited out of the kingdom.²

The theft caused much comment at Berlin, and made Frederick very angry, but he took no violent action against the English minister. His attitude in the matter is revealed in the following extract from a letter to de Maltzan:

But I must tell you of an act of singular daring and recklessness on the part of Chevalier Elliot. That minister took the liberty, through one of his domestics, of abstracting the portfolio of Lee, the American, from his desk in the *auberge de Corsica*, in Berlin; and the theft having made a noise, he not only brought back the portfolio to the American, but, moreover, came himself to avow the theft to my minister, with all the circumstances that accompanied it, making various poor excuses for the part he took in it. It is properly what is called a public theft; and if I had wished to make him feel the resentment which the law of nations authorizes, and which he richly deserved, I would immediately have forbidden him the court. But having himself told his fault, and having submitted his person and his sentence to my discretion and generosity, I did not wish to push things to an extreme, and confined myself to notifying him through my ministers of the impropriety and lawlessness of his conduct.

Such, in fine, is the minister whom the court where you are has chosen to reside at mine, and you can judge very well what would have been the sensation created by a similar performance there, and how the chevalier Elliot would have been regarded. It is in the school of Bute that such scholars are found.

[In the handwriting of Frederick.] Oh! the worthy pupil of Bute! Oh! *l'homme incomparable que votre Gott Damme Elliot!* In truth, the English ought to blush with shame at sending such ministers to foreign courts.³

The British government made haste to disavow the action of its minister, both through that minister himself and also through de Maltzan, and Frederick was told that he was at liberty to signify a desire for Elliot's recall.⁴ But the king was not desirous of further straining his relations with England, so he gave to Hertzberg

¹ J. Q. Adams, *Letters on Silesia*, London, 1804, 257-258.

² For accounts of the theft see Lee to the Commissioners, June 28, 1777, and to the Committee of Foreign Affairs, July 28, 1777; Frederick to de Maltzan, June 30, 1777, Circourt, III, 211; Hertzberg to Frederick, June 28, 1777; and other letters. A portion of this correspondence is given by Sparks and Wharton. Carlyle's *Frederick*, VI. 343-345, contains a not very accurate account of the affair. See also the *North American Review* for April, 1830.

³ Frederick to de Maltzan, June 30, 1777, Circourt, III. 211; in Sparks and Wharton.

⁴ Hertzberg to Frederick, June 28, June 30, August 11, and August 26, 1777; de Maltzan to Frederick, August 1, 1777; etc.

the following directions: "I do not wish a noise to be made over this affair, and you have only to say to him that out of consideration for the king of England and of his own youth we will pass over the matter in silence."¹ To Lee, the man who had suffered from the theft, but little satisfaction was given,² except what might be gained from receiving a copy of the magistracy proceedings, which had been begun before the real nature of the theft had become known. This copy he desired for use in proving to his associates his own fidelity and loyalty.³ It would, however, be a mistake to infer from this lack of action on the part of Frederick any unfriendliness towards the colonies. Frederick was but following his policy of keeping out of the struggle. The theft aroused his anger, but he did not feel that it was wise to punish it; for, while the resentment of the colonies was not a thing to be feared, that of England was.

Shortly afterward Lee quitted Berlin for Paris, but not before he had received a definite answer upon the points in the negotiation. Schulenburg informed him that the propositions were not acceptable, as they put the affairs of the king in jeopardy without giving the hope of any very solid advantages.⁴ Thus closed this effort to obtain the assistance of Prussia.

The later negotiations were carried on entirely by correspondence. Lee had obtained permission to keep the Prussian court informed of the progress of the war, and in the next few weeks he took advantage of the permission to write two letters urging that the Prussian ports be opened to American vessels.⁵ On receiving the second letter Schulenburg transmitted a translation of it to Frederick with a request for instructions.⁶ Frederick's reply possesses such significance that it should never be lost sight of by any one seeking to unravel the king's policy, and all the later correspondence of the Prussian court with the American agent should be scanned in the light of it. Upon the margin of Schulenburg's letter Frederick wrote, "Mit Complimenten abweisen", that is, "Put him off with compliments."

Lee's next request was for information concerning the probability that the English would in the following year be able to draw

¹ Frederick to Hertzberg on Hertzberg's letter of August 11, 1777.

² A. Lee to Frederick, July 1, 1777; Frederick to A. Lee, July 2, 1777, both in Sparks and Wharton. See also Schulenburg to Frederick, July 3, 1777.

³ Schulenburg to Frederick, July 6, 1777.

⁴ Schulenburg to Frederick, July 6, 1777; Lee to Committee of Foreign Affairs, July 29, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁵ A. Lee to Schulenburg, August 13 and September 21, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁶ Schulenburg to Frederick, October 6, 1777.

more recruits from Germany, Russia, or Denmark.¹ Schulenburg referred Lee's request to Frederick, and upon Schulenburg's letter the king wrote, "none from Russia, none from Denmark, but some men from Anspach, and from the prince of Hesse."² In consenting that Schulenburg should give this information Frederick showed himself in perhaps the most friendly attitude toward the colonies in which he had yet appeared.

About the same time Frederick refused to allow the passage of the mercenary troops from Baireuth, Anspach, and Cassel across his dominions,³ and some writers have seen in this action another evidence of his friendship for America. His correspondence and other writings do not bear out this theory. To his minister to England he wrote that he refused their passage because of certain mutinies that had taken place among the mercenaries the year before while they were on their way to embark.⁴ A passage already quoted from his *Memoirs after the Peace* shows that the refusal gave him some pleasure because it disobliged England. In the same work he states that he refused because he did not like to see Germany denuded of troops.⁵ Furthermore, he was doubtless disgusted by the sight of Germans being sold like cattle, and wished to discourage the practice. In refusing passage to the mercenaries he does not, however, seem to have thought, as some writers have asserted, that he was thereby bestowing belligerent rights upon the colonies, for, as will later be seen, he for a time withdrew the prohibition.

Frederick continued steadfast in the determination not to enter into formal diplomatic relations with the colonies until he was able to see on which side Fortune would declare herself. On November 17, 1777, Arthur Lee wrote to Schulenburg stating that Congress had appointed his brother, William Lee, commissioner to the Prussian court with powers to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce, and requesting to be informed as to whether it was the king's pleasure that his brother should come to Berlin. But Schulenburg replied that the king "cannot possibly conjecture, as circumstances have not changed, what propositions Mr. Lee can make more acceptable to His Majesty, nor consequently what can be the object of his mission."⁶

On the fourth of the following month Arthur Lee wrote to Schulenburg confirming the glorious news of the surrender of

¹ A. Lee to Schulenburg, October 23, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

² Schulenburg to Frederick, November 4, 1777, Circourt, III. 116.

³ Frederick to Goltz, November 10, 1777, *ibid.*, 116; Elliot to Suffolk, November 8, 11, and 16, 1777, *ibid.*, 8, 9.

⁴ Frederick to de Maltzan, November 17 and 28, 1777.

⁵ *Works*, IV. 178.

⁶ Schulenburg to A. Lee, November 28, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

Burgoyne. Schulenburg transmitted the letter to Frederick at Potsdam,¹ and the king received the news with great satisfaction. Upon the letter he wrote: "This is very good, but it is necessary to tell him that I expect (*j'attens*) to recognize the independence of the Americans when France shall have set the example." Accordingly, Schulenburg wrote to Lee: "I am much pleased, sir, with these favorable events. . . . I can assure you, sir, that His Majesty will not be the last power to recognize the independence of the Americans, but you will yourself feel that it is not natural that he should be the first, and that at least France, whose political and commercial interests are more immediately connected with yours, should set the example."² Six weeks later Schulenburg again wrote to Lee in the same favorable strain. "His Majesty wishes that your generous efforts may be crowned with complete success; and, as I have already advised you, in my letter of December 18, he will not hesitate to acknowledge your independence whenever France, which is more interested in the event of this contest, shall set the example." He added that the Americans were at liberty to purchase arms in Prussia and that the "bankers Splittgerber, contractors for the manufacture of arms, have received directions to deliver such as you may demand."³

Taking advantage of this permission, Arthur Lee soon afterwards purchased of Messrs. Splittgerber eight hundred fusils of a kind that Schulenburg had recommended as being cheap but serviceable. Later he discovered that the guns were "of the worst and most ordinary workmanship"; they were old worn-out muskets such as even the American militia would reject. Towards the close of 1778 Lee demanded of Schulenburg that Messrs. Splittgerber be compelled to do him justice⁴; but Schulenburg replied that the matter was one which must be left to the courts, and ironically added that Lee, as a good republican, ought to be aware that the Prussian king had no despotic power to force the righting of private breaches of contract.⁵ Thus the result of the permission to purchase arms in Prussia was far from being advantageous to the Americans.

Frederick's motives for expressing his intention of recognizing the Americans when France should have set the example will probably never be determined. He may have thought that Fortune had at last declared herself against England and that the end of the

¹ Schulenburg to Frederick, December 15, 1777, Circourt, III. 125.

² Schulenburg to A. Lee, December 18, 1777, in Sparks and Wharton.

³ Schulenburg to A. Lee, January 16, 1778, in Sparks and Wharton; partly given in Circourt, III. 131.

⁴ A. Lee to Schulenburg, October 21, 1778, in Sparks and Wharton.

⁵ Schulenburg to A. Lee, December 1, 1778.

war was close at hand. Perhaps, with Machiavellian craftiness, he expected that the contents of his letter to Lee would be communicated to the French ministry and would influence them to declare for the Americans and thus become embroiled with England. Whatever his motives may have been, it is unlikely, in view of the obstinate determination of the English to continue the war, that he would have hazarded following France. Just what his action would have been under the conditions then existing on the continent will never be known, for an unexpected event occurred which soon resulted in complications that required all his attention. On December 30, 1777, died Max Joseph, elector of Bavaria. Immediately the ambitious young Emperor Joseph II. proceeded to lay claim to the dead prince's domains and to back up his claims by force of arms. The aged Frederick, feeble though he was and averse to war, felt it necessary to oppose this aggression on the part of Austria and ultimately to wage the short and comparatively bloodless Bavarian War.¹ In consequence, he had little time to think of the struggle in far-off America, and was obliged to be doubly cautious not to become engaged in hostilities with a power which held Hanover and which was on friendly terms with many of the German princes whose support he craved.

It was not long before Frederick was pointing out that he now had no time to think of the war in America. "But the fermentation of affairs in Germany", he wrote March 12 to de Maltzan, "makes me forget that of England with her colonies." He expressed himself in much the same terms when the Americans again pressed their negotiations. When William Lee, after the alliance with France had been consummated, wrote to say that he was hopeful that His Majesty would think it good for him to repair to Berlin, he met with the response² that the king was too much occupied with Germany to think of America, and that while he would, were circumstances favorable, willingly recognize American independence, such action would at that juncture be of no advantage to America and prejudicial to Prussia.

Later in the same month the king again instructed Schulenburg to refuse to enter into a commercial connection with the Americans and to advise them to cultivate relations with maritime states.³ Thus the king's promise to recognize the colonies when France should set the example was not fulfilled.

¹ *Works*, IV. 205-271.

² The answer written on the margin of a letter from Schulenburg to Frederick, March 30, 1778.

³ On Schulenburg's letter to Frederick, March 30, 1778.

So much embarrassed, in fact, did Frederick find himself as a result of the emperor's ambitious designs upon Bavaria that on March 16, 1778, he wrote to de Maltzan in order to inquire whether there was any probability that England would be willing to furnish Hanoverian troops to defend the Germanic Constitution against the emperor's encroachments. In asking for this information he cautioned his minister against letting the English government suspect that he wished to learn anything upon the subject; nevertheless, the letter is certainly in a different strain from one written four years earlier in which the king had said that it was as likely that a good Christian should league himself with the devil as he with England. As it happened, nothing of importance ever came of the inquiry; but Frederick did at times show a somewhat more obliging spirit toward England, and at various times granted permission, at the request of Elliot, for the passage of German mercenaries across his dominions.¹

At times Frederick seems to have grown tired of the persistency of the American agent. Thus, on July 30, 1778, he ordered Schulenburg to write to the agent once more "what I have already ten times said." Again, in the following December we find Schulenburg transmitting to Finckenstein, who was with the king at Breslau, a letter from William Lee, and explaining his reason for doing so as follows: "This letter embarrasses me, particularly because the king, when I presented to His Majesty in the summer another from the agent, seemed to me to be a little disgusted at his returning so often to the charge."² Finckenstein must have shown Lee's letter to Frederick, for on the nineteenth of the same month Frederick wrote to Schulenburg that the American proposed nothing new and that the same answer should be given to him as hitherto.

Even after the close of the short Bavarian War the Prussian king continued without material change the attitude that he had adopted at the beginning of that struggle. What was the only approach, in the remotest degree, to a concession will appear from the following extract from a letter written by Schulenburg to William Lee on January 2, 1779: "I have the honor to tell you, sir, that the ports of His Majesty are open to all nations who come there to trade in goods the importation of which is not forbidden in his states, so that the merchants from America will have no need of express permission in order to enter freely and be well received in the port of Emden or such other as they may choose." He said, however,

¹ Frederick to de Maltzan, February 15, 1780; Elliot to Suffolk, February 28, 1778, and January 7, 1779.

² Schulenburg to Finckenstein, December 8, 1778.

that the king would not protect the commerce of one nation against another, nor shelter in his ports prizes taken by another power. In commenting upon the matter a week later Frederick told Schulenburg that if the Americans wished to come into Emden, it was well and good, but that he could not promise to protect them, and that a perfect neutrality must more than ever be preserved.

Following up the slight encouragement given by Schulenburg, William Lee asked for "an express convention or at least for a positive declaration from His Majesty that he comprehends the United States in the number of nations" who might enter and trade in the Prussian ports.¹ But Schulenburg was not to be thus drawn into what would have constituted a formal recognition of the colonies; he merely replied that further assurances appeared to him to be superfluous and unnecessary.²

From this time onward the relations of the two powers continued without material change until the close of the Revolution. The independence of the colonies was not recognized by Frederick until after it had been recognized by England herself, and it was not until June of 1783 that Baron Goltz at Paris made overtures to Franklin for a commercial agreement between the two countries.³

From the evidence that has been advanced it is clear that the colonies gained but slight advantage from their direct negotiations with the Prussian monarch. At the same time it is unquestionably true that his course in the European politics of the period was, because of coincident interests, of considerable benefit to the struggling patriots across the Atlantic. This was true of Frederick's relations with France. About the time the Revolution broke out conditions were such in Europe that he deemed it desirable to cultivate the friendship of that power. In the ambitious projects of Joseph II. the Prussian king saw a grave menace to the peace of the continent and to the interests of his own kingdom.⁴ At the moment Frederick found himself without any other ally than Russia, and there was "reason to fear", he thought, "that a new war in the Crimea might prevent the empress of Russia from furnishing the king with that aid which she was by treaty obliged to furnish".⁵ Frederick, therefore, deemed it wise to seek an alliance with France. But in the attempt he had a rival. Joseph, too, courted that power and wished to continue the alliance that existed during the Seven Years' War. In accomplishing this end he counted much upon the

¹ W. Lee to Schulenburg, January 30, 1779.

² Schulenburg to W. Lee, February 17, 1779.

³ Goltz to Frederick, June 20, 1783.

⁴ *Works*, IV. 191 *et seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV. 198.

aid of the French queen, his sister Marie Antoinette. Against him, however, was the old French feeling of hostility to the House of Hapsburg and the knowledge that the previous alliance had been productive of much disaster.

The situation was rendered much more complicated by the war in America. The natural enemy of France was England, and it was almost inevitable that France should seize upon so favorable an opportunity in order to take revenge for the losses inflicted upon her in the previous war. This the far-sighted Frederick early foresaw, and, although he foresaw also the ruinous effects of a new war upon enfeebled France, his desire to see England humbled and his anxiety that France should find occupation outside of Germany led him to encourage the French court to enter the struggle.¹

The diplomatic contest resulted in Frederick's favor. Although Joseph even visited Paris in pursuance of his object, he found the French king and ministry disinclined to listen to his proposals, while the influence of his sister was too slight to bring to pass what he had at heart.² Later the French showed themselves friendly to Frederick, and through a French agent, sent to him under pretext of attending the midsummer reviews of 1777 at Magdeburg, the Prussian monarch succeeded in arriving at an understanding with the French court upon the question of the foreign policy of the two powers.³ Thereafter Frederick continued to encourage France in her desire to humble England and to assure her of his neutrality in case of a struggle.⁴

That these representations were influential in leading the court of France to take up the American cause is not to be doubted. Had Frederick's influence been thrown instead in favor of England, it is quite conceivable that the treaty of 1778 might never have been made. Thus by his attitude the Prussian king rendered consider-

¹ Frederick to de Maltzan, September 28, 1776; to Goltz, April 23, June 11, June 29, October 3, November 14, December 9, 1776, and January 2, 1777, etc.; Circourt, 68, 71, 73. Circourt gives the letter of April 23 incorrectly as April 25.

² Frederick to Goltz, January 2, 1777; *Works*, IV. 189-201.

³ Frederick to Goltz, May 8, June 1, June 7, June 11, 1777; Goltz to Frederick, June 26, 1777; cf. Circourt, III. 90, 92, 93, 95.

⁴ "No, certainly," he wrote to Baron Goltz on July 31, 1777, for the information of France, "we have no jealousy of the aggrandizement of France. We even pray for her success provided her armies are not found near Wesel or Halberstadt." "You can assure M. de Maurepas," he instructed the same minister in the following August, "that I have no connection whatever with England, nor do I grudge to France any advantages she may gain by war with the colonies." "The independence of the colonies will be worth to France all that the war will cost"; "I wager a hundred to one that in case a rupture between the two crowns should break out next year, France could promise herself some great advantages", are two sentences taken from among dozens of similar ones contained in letters written by him to Goltz during the next few months (see Circourt, III. 98-128).

able service to the colonies. But it should be borne in mind that nowhere is there any evidence to show that the favorable influence he exerted sprang out of a love for the struggling patriots across the Atlantic.

In Russia also Frederick secretly opposed the English, and as he was in alliance with the Empress Catharine, his influence was considerable. While he seems to have had no direct connection with the refusal of the empress in 1776 to furnish troops to England, his advice in the years that followed was no small factor in determining her policy.¹ At the Russian court there were two rival parties, headed respectively by Count Panin, who was minister of foreign affairs, and Prince Potemkin; Panin was very friendly to Frederick and was opposed to England, while Potemkin, who wished to discredit his rival, came in time, through the efforts of the English minister, to lean toward the side of England. In matters of foreign affairs, however, the empress generally followed the advice of Panin, and hence the wishes of Frederick had great weight. The English were well aware that Frederick's influence was being cast against them, but were unable to do anything to counteract it, for on the subject of the desirability of allowing England to be humbled Panin and the Prussian king were in complete accord.²

One of the things that Frederick's influence brought about which was contrary to English interests was a more friendly feeling between the courts of Russia and of France,³ but his greatest triumph in this direction was in connection with the formation of the Armed Neutrality. In the early months of 1780 the Russian vessel *Concordia* was seized by the Spaniards, who were now at war with England, and was carried into Cadiz. Angered by this insult to her flag, the empress caused a memorial to be drawn up and presented to the Spanish minister. This had hardly been done before news arrived at St. Petersburg of the seizure of a second vessel. Thereupon the empress, without consulting Panin, ordered her navy to be prepared for active service and adopted measures for the protection of her commerce against the belligerents.⁴ The moment was a most critical one. Prince Potemkin professed to Harris the belief that at last a great triumph had been gained for England.⁵ But when Panin was informed of what the empress had done, he quickly

¹ Bancroft, V. 97 (ed. 1878).

² Harris to Suffolk, February 2, 6, 10, and 24, 1778; to Sir J. Yorke, February 13, 1778; to Weymouth, June 4, 25, August 18, September 20, 1779, February 26, 1780; to Eden, June 29, July 30, 1779; and numerous other letters in *Malmesbury Diaries and Correspondence*, 1844. Frederick to Solms, August 14, 1779, Circourt, III. 225; Goertz to Frederick, September 24, 1779, *ibid.*, 227.

³ *Works*, IV. 201.

⁴ Goertz to Frederick, February 29 and March 3, 1780, Circourt, III. 235, 238.

⁵ Harris to Stormont, February 26, 1780, in *Malmesbury Diaries and Correspondence*.

evolved an adroit plan to turn her action to the disadvantage of the English. This plan he confided to Goertz, and on February 29, 1780, Goertz wrote to Frederick:

All will now depend upon the reply the Spanish court makes to the remonstrances. If it gives a satisfactory one, as they have a right to expect, then I agree with Count Panin in thinking that this new intrigue will result to the disadvantage of the one who contrived it and of his court. If unhappily the court of Spain persists in its false measures, the worst is to be feared. . . . Your Majesty will be best able to enlighten her in the matter, and having already proved your impartiality, you have a right at so important a moment to speak with frankness.¹

Upon receipt of this intelligence Frederick saw the importance of action. On March 14 he sent to his minister at Paris instructions to "demand a particular audience of the ministry at Versailles", and to use every endeavor to induce them to impress upon the Spanish court "the absolute necessity of satisfying Russia without the slightest delay on an article where the honor of her flag is so greatly interested."² The French minister, Vergennes, read Frederick's letter, and despatched a copy of it to the French representative at Madrid with orders to use all his influence to get Spain to apologize.³ The Spanish court saw the wisdom of such a course and followed it. A satisfactory answer was given to Russia, and a possible war was thereby averted.⁴

Later both France and Spain, partly because of advice given by Frederick, acquiesced in the new maritime code that the empress had promulgated on March 8, 1780.⁵ Thus, through the adroit management of Panin and the assistance rendered by Frederick, a declaration that the English minister had hoped would result in an armed conflict between Russia and the family of the Bourbons became in the end a measure wholly opposed to the interests of England. By the part he played in bringing about this result—comparatively unimportant as the Armed Neutrality really proved—Frederick unquestionably contributed indirectly to the success of the colonies.

It was, in fact, in ways such as these that whatever assistance the colonies received from Frederick was chiefly rendered. The direct assistance he gave them was certainly very slight. He did not recognize their independence until it had been recognized by England herself. His commercial concessions were of little real value; his permission to purchase arms in his dominions resulted, though

¹ *Ibid.*, 237-238.

² *Ibid.*, 241.

³ Vergennes to Montmorin, March 27, 1780.

⁴ Goertz to Frederick, May 2, 1780.

⁵ Goertz to Frederick, March 10, Circourt, III. 240, May 2, 1780, and other letters.

through no fault of his own, in a disastrous bargain for the Americans. He gave a little good advice and a small amount of information, but, on the whole, what he did directly was really very trivial. On the other hand, the indirect aid which he rendered as a result of coincident interests was more important. Had he been a friend to England instead of being secretly in opposition to her, it is quite conceivable that the course of history might have been materially changed. The relations between Russia and England might have been different. Certainly France would have hesitated longer. Probably the minor German states would have furnished England with more mercenaries. But "what might have been" is speculation pure and simple.

Less difficult to determine are the motives that moved Frederick in his policy toward the colonies. As has already been pointed out, he hated England with great intensity, yet at the same time he saw clearly that the interests of his kingdom demanded that he should not become her open enemy. In consequence, he carried his hostility just far enough not to embroil him in a war with England. He would not recognize the colonies because that would have taken him over the danger line. At times he even performed friendly acts and exercised great forbearance in order to prevent his relations with England from becoming too strained; instances are his leniency toward Elliot in the matter of the theft of Lee's papers, and his giving permission for the mercenaries to cross his dominions. On the other hand, as a result of his hatred for England, it was psychologically natural that he should feel well-disposed toward the colonies. But it would be easy to overestimate this feeling of friendship. Nowhere is there any evidence to show that he had a very deep interest in the colonies for their own sake. Unquestionably he wished them success, but all expressions of friendship made by him or his ministers should be scrutinized in the light of his avowed intention to procrastinate in the negotiations and of his instruction to Schulenburg, "Mit Complimenten abweisen." Frederick was, indeed, very much interested in the contest; of this the hundreds of letters in which he mentioned the subject are proof conclusive. But the reader of these letters can see with half an eye that it is in the effect of the war upon England and upon the politics of Europe that he was chiefly interested, not in its effects upon the colonies. At one time a story was widely current, and it is still believed by many, to the effect that he entertained a great admiration for Washington, and that he even went so far as to send him a sword upon which was inscribed, "From the oldest general in the world to the greatest." This is one of those many historical myths that have been eagerly accepted by

a willing and credulous public, and it has been completely exploded.¹ Furthermore, as Bancroft admits, there is nowhere in Frederick's correspondence any trace of a personal interest in Washington.² Much the same may be affirmed of his interest in the colonies. His rather friendly attitude toward them was due chiefly to his hatred for England and to his desire to keep a way open for commercial relations with the new power in case it should sustain its independence. There is little or no evidence to prove that sentiment was a factor in determining his policy.

PAUL LELAND HAWORTH.

¹ See an article by Moncure D. Conway in *The Century Magazine*, XIX. 945.

² Preface to Vol. X. (original edition, 1874).

COMPROMISES OF THE CONSTITUTION

WHEN the question of adopting the Federal Constitution was being considered in the Pennsylvania state convention, James Wilson, who had taken an important part in the framing of that instrument, stated that the gentlemen of the opposition did not appear to appreciate, even in the most difficult part of the plan, the difficulties that had been experienced by the Federal Convention.¹ Inasmuch as the Constitution came forth as the practically unanimous product of the Federal Convention's labors, and the proceedings of that body were secret, it is not surprising that the men of that time should have failed to comprehend the difficulties that had been encountered. Since the publication of the records of the Convention, however, it is somewhat remarkable that those who have attempted to describe the framing of our Constitution should continue under similar if not the same misapprehensions of which Wilson complained in 1787. In nothing is this more clearly shown than in the treatment of the compromises that were such an essential feature of the Convention's work. Not only have some of the most important compromises been completely overlooked, but others have been greatly misrepresented, and in consequence the final outcome of the Convention's proceedings, as well as those proceedings themselves, have been sadly distorted.

The only explanation that appears plausible as to this misinterpretation of perfectly accessible facts is that the great source of our information as to what actually took place in the Federal Convention, the *Madison Papers*, first appeared in 1840.² This was just the time when the slavery question was becoming the all-absorbing topic in our national life, and it was but natural that the men of that time should turn to the debates of the Convention to see what the framers of our Constitution had said and done upon the question that was then uppermost in the minds of all. It is possible that as "Compromise" was the shibboleth of the '40's and '50's, men instinctively tended to support their position by the action of

¹ Elliot's *Debates*, first edition, 1827-1830, III. 297.

² The writer is at present engaged in an attempt to examine all the more important works dealing with the formation of the Constitution, in order to determine, if possible, the origin and development of current misconceptions. That examination is only partially completed, but it has been carried far enough to render extremely probable the explanation that is here given.

the "Fathers" in 1787. Under these conditions it is not surprising that the historical writers of that time, in treating of the formation of the Constitution, should overemphasize the slavery questions in the Convention. Take, for example, Richard Hildreth's *History of the United States*. The third volume, which covers the period of the Revolution and the Confederation, appeared in 1849. Of the chapter that is devoted to the "Formation of the Federal Constitution", one-third is taken up with the slavery debates; and of the "three great compromises" that he notices two are slavery compromises. The second volume of G. T. Curtis's *History of the Constitution* was published in 1858. Although Curtis does not neglect, as Hildreth did, the other features of the Convention's work, and although he corrects Hildreth's misapprehension that the counting of three-fifths of the slaves was the essential feature of the compromise in which both representation and direct taxation were to be apportioned according to population, he distinctly exaggerates the importance of the slavery questions and he chooses the same three provisions as the "grand compromises of the Constitution."

Knowing how closely one writer is apt to follow the thought if not the words of another writer, especially if the earlier work is regarded as authoritative, it may be readily understood why practically all subsequent writers have followed the lead of two such men as Hildreth and Curtis. George Bancroft, it is true, does not lay himself open to this charge, and in his *History of the Constitution* (1882) has produced the most detailed and unprejudiced study of our subject that has yet appeared. But even Bancroft failed to appreciate the significance of the Federal Convention's action in at least two cases to which particular attention is to be given in this article—the admission of new states and the method of electing the president. That his general interpretation of the Convention's work is not more universally accepted is doubtless due to the difficulty of appreciating his point of view. Owing to the tediousness of his method and to his inability or unwillingness to summarize his conclusions, Bancroft's work is really difficult to comprehend. Consequently there are many who cite him as an authority, but apparently few who really follow him.¹

¹ An interesting illustration of this is to be found in the use of the term "Connecticut Compromise" for the agreement that was reached on the composition of the two houses of the legislature. Bancroft apparently adopted this designation because he believed, by a somewhat exaggerated interpretation of the part taken by them, that to the Connecticut delegates should be given the credit of getting this compromise adopted. Later writers have so generally accepted this appellation that its use has become almost universal, but the explanations as to why this compromise is so called are by no means harmonious. Perhaps Alexander Johnston's fanciful claim "that the birth of the Constitution was merely the grafting of the Connecticut system on the stock of the old Confed-

Is it not time to break away from the traditions that have been handed down to us from the days of the slavery struggle? (One of those, the so-called "three-fifths compromise", ought certainly to be relegated to the myths of the past. That five slaves should count as three freemen had been incorporated in the revenue amendment of 1783 and had been accepted by eleven states before the Federal Convention ever met. When the Randolph resolutions were being considered in the Committee of the Whole, this same rule, avowedly taken from the proposed amendment to the Articles of Confederation, was adopted by a vote of nine to two.¹ It was also embodied in the New Jersey plan. To regard this as a compromise is altogether a misinterpretation. It was aptly described by Rufus King in the Massachusetts state convention when he said that "this rule . . . was adopted, because it was the language of all America."²

The other slavery compromise, upon the slave-trade and navigation acts, was a genuine compromise.³ It is quite misleading, however, to put it among the foremost questions of the Convention. The executive, judiciary, western states, control of militia, and a dozen other subjects, all ranked above it in importance. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that in 1787 the slavery question was not the important question, we might say it was not the moral question that it was in 1850. The South demanded concessions, but the North was ready to make them, especially if it could obtain some concessions in return.⁴ To magnify these questions to the exclusion or to the belittling of other interests is a complete misreading of history.

It has been customary to regard as compromises only such decisions as were reached in the Convention after sharp separation of parties along certain accepted lines of division, the appointment of a committee to devise some means of accommodation, and the adoption of their report or some other conciliatory measure requiring both

eration", and his altogether unwarranted statement that the terms of the compromise were "commonly cited as 'the Connecticut proposal'" (*Connecticut*, 322-325) have been of service. At any rate, the more generally accepted explanation of designating this compromise the Connecticut Compromise is to the effect that its principles were borrowed from that state, where was to be found popular representation in one branch of the legislature and local representation in the other — an explanation for which there appears to be no basis either in the records of the Convention or in the writings of Bancroft.

¹ Gilpin, *Papers of James Madison*, 842-843.

² Elliot, first edition, I. 56.

³ It may not be amiss to reiterate here the position that is taken by the more careful writers upon this subject, that the prohibition of export taxes formed no part of this compromise. Cf. Gilpin, 1388, 1396-1397, 1415; Curtis, II. 296, note, 302-304; Bancroft, II. 152, 158.

⁴ Compare Luther Martin's statement in "The Genuine Information laid before the Legislature of Maryland," in Yates, *Secret Proceedings*, 1821, 64.

sides to make more or less of a concession. It would not seem, however, to be an undue extension of the term, if under compromises we include cases in which the divisions were so sharp and the opinions so fixed as to force such a modification of certain provisions as would leave the clauses in question acceptable to both sides without antagonizing either, although no committees had to be appointed to accomplish these results. For example, in that part of the plan of government which provided for the organization of a federal judiciary, the provision that "Congress may . . . establish" inferior courts was phrased in this way to render it acceptable to those who favored the establishment of such courts, and to those who insisted that such tribunals would interfere with the rightful jurisdiction of the state courts.¹ Again, the provision that "all debts . . . shall be as valid against the United States as under the Confederation" was not modeled after the clause in the Articles of Confederation, as is so frequently stated; the wording is significantly different and was intended to reconcile the conflicting opinions of those who wanted the central government to assume the state debts, and of those who were opposed to such assumption.² But the most important of such modified clauses was that which provided for the admission of new states.

In colonial times, as population increased, in many instances so largely through the immigration of foreigners, and as settlement extended into the back country, the conservative moneyed interests of the coast, jealous of their power and fearful for their property, insisted upon retaining the control of government in their own hands and refused to grant to the interior counties the share in government to which their numbers of population entitled them. This was seen in its most obvious form in the inequality of representation in the legislature. Notably was this the case in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the Carolinas.³ And this inequality was maintained in the state governments that were formed after the outbreak of the Revolution. When the question of representation in the national legislature was before the Federal Convention, the same interests demanded similar restrictions. Pennsylvania's method of dealing with the frontier counties was cited with approval.⁴ As it had worked well there for the older portions of the state to keep the power in their

¹ Gilpin, 798-800.

² *Ibid.*, 1356-1358, 1378-1379, 1402, 1424-1426. See statement by Bancroft, II 145.

³ See "Memorial of the Paxton Men", in Parkman's *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, Appendix E; Lincoln, *Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania*; Jefferson, *Notes on Virginia*; Bassett, "Regulators of North Carolina", in *A. H. A. Report*, 1894; and Schaper, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina", *ibid.*, 1900.

⁴ Gilpin, 1072.

own hands, so now in the United States, it was insisted, new states ought not to be admitted on an equal footing with the old states.

Gouverneur Morris was the champion of the commercial and propertied interests, and when the compromise on representation was under discussion he declared in favor of considering property as well as the number of inhabitants in apportioning representatives. In explanation of his position he stated that he had in mind the "range of new States which would soon be formed in the West", and "he thought the rule of representation ought to be so fixed, as to secure to the Atlantic States a prevalence in the national councils."¹ A little later, on Morris's motion and evidently to phrase his views, a committee was appointed² and made a report,³ which was frankly declared to be intended to give to the Atlantic states the power of "dealing out the right of representation in safe proportions to the Western States."⁴ This portion of the report was at first adopted,⁵ but was afterwards disregarded when the compromise was reached by which it was agreed to apportion both representation and taxation according to numbers of population.⁶

It is generally assumed that the question was thus finally disposed of. But Morris was not so easily defeated. The Committee of Detail to draft a constitution included in the article for the admission of new states a provision that such new states should "be admitted on the same terms with the original states."⁷ Doubtless this provision was inserted because the committee so interpreted the action or sentiments of the Convention, or believed it warranted by them. When the article came up, in its turn, for consideration, Morris protested against this provision, and he made his objection on the same grounds as his previous opposition to representation in proportion to the numbers of population: "He did not wish to bind down the Legislature to admit Western States on the terms here stated. . . . [He] did not mean to discourage the growth of the Western country. . . . He did not wish, however, to throw the power into their hands."⁸ Such men as Madison, Mason, and Sher-

¹ *Ibid.*, 1033-1034.

² *Ibid.*, 1036, 1039.

³ *Ibid.*, 1051-1052.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1052-1053.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1053.

⁶ In the first stages of the discussion of the question of numbers of representatives, the conflicting interests of East and West were more important than those of slave and free states. Our later writers apparently fail to appreciate this fact, although it is clearly brought out by Hildreth, Curtis, and Bancroft.

⁷ *Journal of the Convention*, 1819, 228. Professor William A. Dunning, *Essays on Civil War and Reconstruction*, 310, interprets this as referring only to the new states arising within the boundaries of any of the old states. From the wording alone, the meaning is doubtful, but the debate in the Convention upon this clause does not support Professor Dunning's interpretation. See Gilpin, 1456-1457.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1456-1457.

man opposed him,¹ but Morris succeeded in getting the objectionable clause stricken out, and then without a dissenting voice the Convention agreed to his substitute, "New States may be admitted by the Legislature into the Union",² or as it reads in the final draft, "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union."³

This phraseology is apparently so artless that it might well obtain the unanimous support of the Convention, but in view of its origin and authorship it acquires great significance. How great this is one hardly realizes until he reads Morris's own interpretation of the clause. Sixteen years later, at the time of the Louisiana purchase, in a letter to Henry W. Livingston,⁴ he wrote:

Your inquiry. . . is substantially whether the Congress can admit, as a new State, territory, which did not belong to the United States when the Constitution was made. In my opinion they cannot.

I always thought that, when we should acquire Canada and Louisiana it would be proper to govern them as provinces, and allow them no voice in our councils. In wording the third section of the fourth article, I went as far as circumstances would permit to establish the exclusion. Candor obliges me to add my belief, that, had it been more pointedly expressed, a strong opposition would have been made.⁵

Within the scope of this article it is not possible to discuss the whole "bundle of compromises" that make up the Constitution. If it were, it would be interesting to trace the fortunes of the clause that vests in the House of Representatives the right of originating money bills: how it was originally an exclusive right; how, in this form, it was sufficient to turn the scale in favor of the first great compromise⁶; how it served again in the same way in determining the compromise on the method of electing the president⁷; and how, when

¹ *Ibid.*, 1457.

² *Ibid.*, 1457-1458. The writer is indebted to Professor Frederick J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, for first calling his attention to the possible significance of the wording of this clause.

³ Constitution, Article IV., Section 3.

⁴ December 4, 1803, Sparks, *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, III. 192.

⁵ Mr. Justice Campbell in delivering his concurring opinion in the Dred Scott case (19 Howard, 507) cited this letter of Morris's, and it was also introduced in support of the Government's cause when the Insular Cases were argued recently before the Federal Supreme Court. It is interesting to note, however, that in the latter instance only so much of the letter was quoted as asserts the right to govern as provinces, without voice in the federal councils, territory not originally belonging to the United States. That part of the letter which denies the right of admitting such territory into the Union was significantly omitted; *Brief in the Insular Cases*, Washington, 1901, 164.

Bancroft, *History of the Constitution*, sixth edition, II. 163, omits this particular letter but cites others by the same hand in support of his surprising statement that Morris "gave his ancient fears to the winds", and proposed the clause in question, "with the full understanding and intention that an ordinary act of legislation should be sufficient by a bare majority to introduce foreign territory as a state into the union."

⁶ Gerry: "It was the corner stone of the accommodation"; Gilpin, 1098.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 1501, note.

its sphere of usefulness as a compromise-factor was ended, it was ruthlessly shorn of its virtues by granting to the Senate an unrestricted privilege of amendment, and then was finally allowed a place in the Constitution. The control of the militia, the restrictions upon appointment to office of members of Congress, the powers of Congress, the restrictions upon the states, and the jurisdiction of the federal courts are some of the subjects that would repay a more careful study than has been generally accorded to them. Partly to show the possibilities of such a study, but mainly because its inherent importance has been so generally disregarded and because of the failure to recognize that the final determination was as genuine a compromise as any that was reached in the Convention—of far greater importance than the so-called slavery compromises, the method of electing the executive has been chosen to illustrate the current misinterpretations of the work and the difficulties of the Federal Convention.

When Wilson, as already cited, complained "how little the difficulties appear to have been noticed by the honorable gentlemen in opposition", he had particular reference to the method of electing the president, and he went on to explain that "the convention were perplexed with no part of this plan, so much as with the mode of choosing the President of the United States." A few weeks previous in the Federal Convention itself and toward the close of its sessions, when this question came up for its final determination, Wilson had expressed himself still more positively, saying: "This subject has greatly divided the House, and will also divide the people out of doors. It is in truth the most difficult of all on which we have had to decide."¹ Madison, in the Virginia state convention, also called attention to the fact "that the organization of the general government was in all its parts very difficult", and that "there was a peculiar difficulty in that of the Executive."²

So natural does it seem to us to have a single person as the chief executive of our federal republic, and so accustomed have we become to the attributes and powers of his office, that it is hard for us to project ourselves into the time before such an office existed and to sympathize with the apprehensions of those men as to the dangers that might lurk under the deceptive title of president. The necessity of a strong executive was clearly recognized, and the members of the Convention were determined that such should be established, but when their determination had been carried out, many stood aghast at the extensive powers that were vested in this officer. In spite of

¹ September 4, *ibid.*, 1491.

² Elliot, first edition, II. 389.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. IX.—32.

all the checks and limitations that were placed, there was color for the assertion that a monarchy, in fact if not in name, had been created. The opponents of the system recurred to this again and again, and its defenders found it difficult to refute the charge. When, in our own day, we find it hard to agree upon a satisfactory definition of monarchy that excludes the president of a republic more powerful than many monarchs, it is not to be wondered at that, at the time of the formation of the Constitution, the supporters of the new order were at a loss to defend their contention that no monarchy had been established.¹ *The president was not a monarch*, but beyond that they could hardly go. In other words, when forced out of generalizations and held down to specific definitions, their best efforts resulted in explaining the presidency in negative terms of monarchy. As an illustration of this, take the note made by President Stiles of Baldwin's account of what had taken place in the Federal Convention:

As to a President, it appeared to be the Opin. of Convention, that he sh^d be a Character respectable by the Nations as well as by the foederal Empire. To this End that as much Power sh^d be given him as could be consistently with guard^e against all possibility of his ascending in a Tract of years or Ages to Despotism and absolute Monarchy: — of which all were cautious. Nor did it appear that any members in Convention had the least Idea of insidiously lay^g the Foundⁿ of a future Monarchy like the European or Asiatic Monarchies either antient or modern. But were unanimously guarded and firm against every Thing of this ultimate Tendency. Accordingly they meant to give considerable Weight as Supreme Executive, but fixt him dependent on the States at large, and at all times impeachable.²

If, then, we recognize the importance attached to the executive office in the minds of the members of the Convention—that, as Randolph said, the people would “behold . . . in the President the form at least of a little monarch”³—it is easy for us to understand that the method of choosing the incumbent of that office should have occasioned the greatest difficulty in a body of such diverse interests and such divergent views, and would naturally occupy a great deal of its attention. On twenty-one different days this subject was brought up in the Convention. Over thirty distinct votes were taken upon different phases of the method of election.⁴ Five times they voted in favor of appointment by the national legislature, and once against it. Once they voted for a system of electors chosen by the

¹ Some said that the president was not a monarch because he was subject to impeachment, while others claimed that it was because he did not hold office for life or during good behavior.

² *Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles*, III. 294.

³ Gilpin, 1313–1314.

⁴ This does not include questions of term or eligibility.

state legislatures, and twice they voted against such a system. Three times they voted to reconsider the whole question. No wonder that Gerry should say, "We seem to be entirely at a loss."¹

In the earlier stages of the discussion the question turned upon whether the executive was to be, as Roger Sherman expressed it, "nothing more than an institution for carrying the will of the legislature into effect";² or was to be independent of and really a check upon the legislative body. As the conception of the new government developed, however, and the executive grew into an all-important feature, the conviction was established that the president must be independent of the legislature, and to accomplish this the favorite method seemed to be some form of an indirect popular election.³ But if the people were to choose, the large states would have a decided advantage, and hence there arose on this question also the old division between the large and the small states. The result was a compromise.

In order to understand the compromise that was made, it must be clearly appreciated that in adopting the electoral system the Convention acted on the assumption that in the great majority of cases—"nineteen times in twenty", Mason claimed⁴—the vote of the electors would not be decisive, that is, a majority of votes would not fall upon the same candidate. There were not wanting, it is true, members of the Convention who asserted that this would not be the case, but after Mason insisted that "Those who think there is no danger of there not being a majority for the same person in the first instance, ought to give up the point to those who think otherwise"⁵, it was tacitly conceded.⁶ With this understanding the terms of the compromise are perfectly clear. As the number of electors from each state was to equal the number of its senators and representatives, the large states, with their greater representation in Congress, would have a distinct advantage. To offset this, when no election resulted—as was assumed generally would be the case—from the highest five candidates a choice was to be made by that body which

¹ Gilpin, 1192.

² *Ibid.*, 763.

³ See statement by Gouverneur Morris in explanation of the report of the grand committee on September 4, *ibid.*, 1489-1490.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1490. In the Virginia state convention he was still more emphatic: "not once out of fifty"; Elliot, first edition, II. 363.

⁵ Gilpin, 1499.

⁶ Several times and by decisive votes the Convention refused to allow a smaller number than a majority of the electors to determine the choice. It is quite possible that here, as in so many other questions before the Convention, the large states or national party accomplished their purpose under a veil of concession. It was not for them to dispute the improbability of an election's resulting in the first instance. If they had the advantage in the choosing of electors, it was certainly still more to their benefit if, contrary to expectations, the electors were able to determine the result.

was equally representative of all the states, and in which it was conceded the small states would have an advantage, the Senate. [In other words, and it was so explained again and again, under this system the large states would nominate the candidates, and the "eventual election" would be controlled by the small states.¹ Owing to the many objections that the giving of this, in addition to the extensive powers already vested in the Senate, would render that body too powerful, the eventual election was transferred from the Senate to the House of Representatives, but the principle was maintained by providing that each state should have but one vote.²]

Although generally overlooked by those who have written on this subject, there can be no doubt that the final determination of the method of electing the president was a genuine compromise.³ Gouverneur Morris,⁴ King,⁵ and Read⁶ referred to it as such in the Federal Convention, and in the Virginia state convention Madison declared in so many words, "Here is a compromise", and he explained how the large states and the small states were affected by it.⁷ Not only was it a compromise, it was the most successful of all the compromises. The importance of the subject and the conflicting opinions in the Convention rendered extremely probable the fulfilment of Wilson's fears that it would greatly "divide the people out of doors", but in 1788 Hamilton could write, "The mode of appointment of the Chief Magistrate of the United States is almost the only part of the system, of any consequence, which has escaped without severe censure."⁸

While the study that is here presented is a slight and evidently but a partial consideration of a really large and important subject, the results that have been attained are not without value. Briefly they might be summarized as follows: The first and greatest compromise of the Constitution was that which determined the composition of the two houses of Congress, the lower house to be representative of the people and the upper house of the states. In the second place, that five slaves should count as three freemen was not the important feature of the compromise by which both representation

¹ Compare statements by Madison, Sherman, King, and Gouverneur Morris in the Federal Convention (Gilpin, 1489, 1499, 1500, 1501, 1504, and 1506), and by Madison in the Virginia state convention (Elliot, first edition, II. 364).

² Gilpin, 1510-1511.

³ Miss House, in her *Study of the Twelfth Amendment*, Philadelphia, 1901, 20, clearly recognizes the fact of a compromise, but she misses its essential elements.

⁴ Gilpin, 1495.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1501-1502. See also Madison's note of explanation on page 1501.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1504.

⁷ Elliot, first edition, II. 364.

⁸ *The Federalist*, No. 68.

and direct taxation were to be apportioned among the states according to their respective numbers of population, which as a whole was only a subordinate part of the first compromise. Thirdly, one of the difficult, and perhaps the most difficult of all the questions that the Convention had to decide, the determination of which required a compromise second in importance only to the first compromise, was that of the method of electing the executive. In the next place, while its relative value must be a matter for individual judgment to determine, the compromise upon the slave-trade and navigation acts must be classed with a number of other matters of distinctly lesser importance. And finally, there are in the Constitution many clauses that one may not be inclined to regard as compromises of quite the same order as those that have just been considered, but they were worded sometimes ambiguously and always significantly, and when studied in this light they achieve an importance far beyond that which is usually accorded to them.¹

MAX FARRAND.

¹ If the interpretation of the compromises that has been given is correct, it would seem to indicate that the whole treatment of the proceedings that resulted in the formation of our Federal Constitution must be revised. The Constitution, if such is the case, is a more direct result from the conditions during the period of the Confederation and a more unbroken development from the Articles of Confederation themselves than is generally supposed.

WILKINSON AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE SPANISH CONSPIRACY

THE story of Spanish-American relations in the trans-Appalachian country after the Revolution is an interesting and important part of our history, a significant portion of the account of the struggle for the possession of the Mississippi basin. Some of the essential facts in this story have heretofore rested in obscurity. Much that has been written is based on suspicion and rumor, not on documentary evidence. Reliance has been placed on the assumptions of Humphrey Marshall¹ and on the assertions and reminiscences contained in the *Proofs* of Daniel Clark and the *Memoirs* of James Wilkinson. Indeed the temptation to fabricate theories in the absence of proof has been almost irresistible. Fortunately, a search in the Archivo Historico-Nacional in Madrid has brought to light material that now enables us to speak with more assurance and in some respects to neglect surmise for the solid ground of fact. Several documents were discovered, of which only one has hitherto been used by historians. The most important of these documents are Wilkinson's first memorial, of August 21, 1787, in English, addressed to Stephen Miro, the governor, and Martin Navarro, the intendant of Louisiana; his declaration of allegiance to the Spanish crown, August 22, 1787, in Spanish; and the formal report of Miro and Navarro, September 25, 1787, to Antonio Valdes y Bazan, the minister of war and treasury of the Indies.² The memorial, it is true, has already

¹ It is true that the rumors and conjectures of Marshall in his *History of Kentucky* happen to be substantially correct in many cases, as the Spanish records testify, but they are not sufficient in themselves to warrant conviction on a controversial point, when unsupported by documentary evidence. See below, page 496, as to Wilkinson's oath of allegiance to Spain.

² All of these documents are in the Archivo Historico-Nacional, Madrid, Papeles de Estado, Legajo 3893 A. In their report to Valdes, Miro and Navarro state that on account of the risks of navigation the English originals, both of the memorial and of the declaration of allegiance, were not sent to Spain at the time. The present writer has been unable to discover their whereabouts. Presumption points, however, to the possibility of their being among 2,500 bundles (*legajos*) of at least 200,000 documents consigned in 1888 from Havana, the former residence of the captain-general of Louisiana and the Floridas, to the Archives of the Indies in Seville, where they now lie in a confused heap on the floor of a cellar room. Owing to the parsimony or the poverty of the Spanish government, these papers, most of which concern the United States, are in their present form practically inaccessible to students, and are being slowly devoured by worms and rotted by mildew.

It is true, then, that in this paper I have not used the original English documents. In spite of this, however, I think there cannot be the slightest doubt of their authen-

been utilized by historians, but only in the expurgated form¹ in which Wilkinson read it before the Kentucky convention² of November 5, 1788. The three³ will serve as the chief authorities for the account that follows of Wilkinson's first trip to New Orleans, and will demonstrate that, not from the Spaniards, but from Wilkinson himself, came the suggestion of a political connection of the western settlements with Louisiana.⁴

At the close of the Revolution Spain withdrew the privilege of trade and navigation along the lower Mississippi, which she had permitted to the Americans as a part of the aid rendered to them against Great Britain before and after her formal alliance with France in 1779. As the settlements west of the Appalachians increased and thrived, a corresponding agitation arose to regain this right. The agitation based itself partly on economic necessity—the river being at that time the only possible outlet for the produce of the country—and partly on the treaty of 1783, whereby Great Britain ceded to the United States her right to navigate the Mississippi as it flows, for the following reasons: (1) because of their substance and style; (2) because they are enclosed in an official letter of the ultra-reserved class signed personally by both Miro and Navarro; (3) because in their previous correspondence they never mention Wilkinson or the possibilities of negotiation with the Kentuckians; (4) because the letter in question, which is duplicated with all its enclosures in the Archives of the Indies, contains copies of the memorial, literal in English and translation into Spanish, and of a Spanish translation of the declaration of allegiance; (5) because the entire communication of the governor and intendant is devoted to comment on the two papers from Wilkinson and a description of Wilkinson's visit; (6) because the two officials assert that Wilkinson gave them the memorial and made the declaration of allegiance; (7) because in later communications of Spanish officials and of Wilkinson himself allusion is made to the fact that he was a Spanish subject and that he had furnished the memorial in question.

¹ For an abstract of this form see Marshall, *Kentucky*, I, 320-322, and Gayarré, *History of Louisiana: Spanish Domination*, 195, who quotes erroneously from Butler's *History of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*, rather than from Marshall.

² "In my opinion," writes Miro to Valdes, April 11, 1789 (Archivo Historico-Nacional, Papeles de Estado, Legajo 3893 A), "by this step he has compromised himself entirely, so that should he not succeed in severing Kentucky from the United States he will not be able to stay there, unless he has suppressed those articles which might be injurious to him—a possible procedure."

³ They are not found in the list of papers copied in the Spanish archives for Louisiana in the middle of the last century, and deposited in the office of the secretary of state at Baton Rouge. Cf. Gayarré, *History of Louisiana: Spanish Domination*, 211, note. In his *Winning of the West*, III, 132, note, Roosevelt, speaking of this work of Gayarré, observes: "He was the first author who gave a full account of the relations between Miro and Wilkinson and of the Spanish intrigues to dismember the West from the Union." But the description given by Gayarré of the earliest relations of Wilkinson with the Spanish authorities at New Orleans is derived absolutely from the three printed sources above mentioned, and notably from Marshall. The comparative fullness of his account, based on the copies of the Spanish manuscripts at Baton Rouge, does not appear until he takes up the occurrences of 1788 and the years following, after Wilkinson had returned from his first visit.

⁴ See pages 495, 498.

derived from the treaty of 1763 with Spain. The backwoodsmen felt that the government of the Confederation was doing nothing to aid them in this respect, and that in the negotiations of Jay with Gardoqui, the Spanish minister, it was even showing a disposition to surrender their claim to the navigation of the Mississippi for certain commercial advantages to the New England states. Other grievances existed as well, and were the ground of serious opposition to both Virginia and the Confederation. If unredressed, they might lead to a separation of Kentucky from the Union.

Both Gardoqui and Miro had good reason therefore to apprehend encroachment by the Americans on the Louisiana territory, and already had begun to take measures of precaution. Their policy of constructing a barrier against American aggression had assumed two forms: the one of encouraging settlement by the Americans, as well as by foreigners, on soil claimed to be Spanish along the east bank of the Mississippi; and the other of supplying arms and ammunition to the Indians against such of the backwoodsmen as trespassed upon the hunting-grounds of savages declared to be under Spanish protection. Neither had been productive of great results. A more powerful agency to combat the American advance must be discovered, and this seemed to be offered by the discontent of the Western settlers, if only some practical method of utilizing it could be devised. But, well informed as they were of this unrest, neither Gardoqui nor Miro had as yet sent emissaries to the Kentucky country when James Wilkinson arrived opportunely at New Orleans.

That officer had emigrated with his family from Maryland to Lexington, Kentucky, in 1783. At the outset he had identified himself with the agitation in regard to the Mississippi,¹ and had even advocated the separation of Kentucky and the other western settlements from the feeble confederation of Atlantic states,² in case the object sought for were otherwise unattainable. Since a trading partnership that he had set up with Major Isaac B. Dunn had not been successful, Wilkinson resolved early in 1787 to make a political and commercial venture in Spanish Louisiana; not, however, until he had discussed the scheme at length, with several men of like character, and prominent in the separatist movement.³ The ostensible motives of Wilkinson in undertaking this journey may be gathered from the statements in his *Memoirs*:⁴

My circumstances being at that period far from affluent, it became my duty to a young and beloved family, to endeavour, by all honourable means, to advance my fortune. . . . on my arrival in Kentucky, my ex-

¹ Marshall, *Kentucky*, I, 312.

² Clark, *Proofs*, appendix, 3, 4: "A Plain Tale", etc.

³ See below, p. 501 *et seq.*

⁴ II. 109-110, 112-113.

pectations were damped by the obstructions, which the Spaniards opposed to the free navigation of the Mississippi. . . . It is notorious that the measures of the federal administration were, at that time, feeble and dilatory. The formation of the national compact, under which we have acquired political importance, was then under consideration; but, it was uncertain at what period the rights of Kentucky, to the navigation of the Mississippi, would be asserted and acknowledged. The pressure of these circumstances, produced my first voyage to New Orleans, with a view to promote my own fortune, and to benefit my fellow citizens, by awakening the Spanish government of Louisiana, to a just sense of its interests, and thereby to effect the commercial intercourse, which was indispensable to the prosperity of the western country. . . . When I first descended the Mississippi in 1787, the project of colonisation which occupied the mind of Mr. Gardoqui, was known to me, and I determined to employ this knowledge, either for my personal emolument or the interests of my fellow citizens. . . . To effect my primary object, the opening the navigation of the river, it was necessary not only to take the ground of safety to the province, but to shew the important advantages, which would be derived to the revenues of Spain, from a commercial intercourse between New Orleans and the settlements of the Ohio. To these considerations, an extensive scheme of colonization¹ was added. . . . There was another project,² depending on the preceding, which was considered of more importance, if it could be effected, in relation to the fortunes of the concerned; this was, that I should demand for my services, in promoting the plan of colonization, the privilege of furnishing, a considerable annual supply of tobacco, to the Mexican market, which would have secured immense fortunes for me and my friends.

Contrary to this plea of poverty, Roosevelt asserts that within three years after Wilkinson's arrival in Kentucky he had "made a good position for himself in matters commercial and political."³ In Clark's *Proofs*,⁴ however, Wilkinson is represented as saying that "He at this period considered his hopes *jeopardised*, and determined to look abroad for what he had not found at home"—which, as Clark tartly remarks,⁵ "I suppose in English means that he was a bankrupt, and that being afraid of his creditors in Kentucky, he went down the Mississippi to seek his fortune and avoid their suits." Marshall, too, observes simply that "Wilkinson, whose habits required the expenditure of money; and whose revenue demanded continued accession; being commercially inclined—and seeing less difficulty in an intercourse with the Spaniards at New Orleans, than the rest of his countrymen: had, coeval with the determination in favour of separation from Virginia, decided upon making a voyage on the Mississippi."⁶ Perhaps it was only natural that those who had

¹ See below, p. 501, note 1.

² Cf. pp. 502, 503, note 2, 505.

³ *Winning of the West*, III. 124.

⁴ Appendix, 4: "A Plain Tale", etc.

⁵ *Proofs*, 12.

⁶ *Kentucky*, I. 270-271.

noticed the share of Wilkinson in this plan of separation should associate the agitation on the subject of navigating the Mississippi, as well as of Spanish pretensions in general, with his trip southward, and believe Wilkinson interested in projects other than mere commercial ventures. Voicing accordingly the sentiment of his time, Marshall says further of Wilkinson, "his object was to effect a political connexion between Spain and Kentucky, of much more importance and extent, than that of shipping tobacco for the New Orleans market."¹ Roosevelt agrees with Gayarré that Wilkinson's primary incentive was pecuniary gain, but he adds² the impulse as well of a "restless, adventurous nature and thirst for excitement and intrigue". The same author surmises³ that "he started with the full intention of entering into some kind of corrupt arrangement with the Louisiana authorities, leaving the precise nature of the arrangement to be decided by events." Wilkinson's real motives and objects, however, were all of these and something more. They appeared definitely in his first memorial to Miro and Navarro.⁴

In April, 1787, after having freighted some flatboats with a small cargo of flour, butter, bacon, and tobacco, he embarked on the Kentucky river and, sailing down the Ohio and Mississippi, arrived at New Orleans on July 2.⁵ His military and political reputation had preceded him,⁶ and Miro forbore to seize his boats and cargo as contraband until the precise object of the American officer's visit could be ascertained.⁷ Upon landing Wilkinson was escorted directly

¹ *Ibid.*, 294.

² *Winning of the West*, III. 124.

³ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁴ See below, p. 498 *et seq.*

⁵ Miro and Navarro to Valdes, September 25, 1787. "In July, 1787," writes Navarro to the king (April 30, 1789, Museo-Biblioteca de Ultramar, Madrid, Papeles relativos á la Luisiana, Vol. III.), "there arrived at New Orleans the ex-brigadier in the American service, Mr. James Wilkinson, a person endowed with high talents, and in whom the aforesaid [western] settlements have placed their hope of future happiness; and he informed the governor and myself that it was the intention of all to put themselves under the protection or vassalage of his Catholic Majesty." Wilkinson himself says that he landed in June (*Memoirs*, II, 109; Clark's *Proofs*, appendix, 4). This statement has been followed by Gayarré (p. 195) and Roosevelt (p. 124). To explain the discrepancy in the dates it may be suggested that Wilkinson had in mind the first of his flatboats, which preceded his arrival at New Orleans by several days. Cf. Clark's *Proofs*, appendix, 7.

⁶ Gayarré (*Louisiana*, III. 194) declares that Wilkinson had already corresponded with "some friends among the merchants of New Orleans" relative to the opening of trade between the western settlements and Louisiana. But neither Clark, Marshall, nor Wilkinson states that he had any extensive acquaintance with merchants of that city or had carried on a correspondence with them. Wilkinson, indeed, asserts distinctly (*Memoirs*, II. 109) that he was a "perfect stranger" when he first landed there.

⁷ The long account given by Clark (*Proofs*, appendix, 7) of the services rendered by his uncle in prevailing upon Miro not to confiscate Wilkinson's property, lest such severity might convert the general's influence in Kentucky into a force very dangerous to the safety of Louisiana, may be true, but all Miro and Navarro say in reference to the matter in their letter to Valdes, September 25, 1787, is that they had been informed that

to the "Government House" by a corporal of the guard and formally presented himself to Miro and Navarro. Their impression of him was highly favorable. "He is a young man of about thirty-three years of age", they write in their letter to Valdes,¹ "although he looks older. His bearing and manners also indicate that he has had an excellent education." Accordingly their reception of him was courteous and even encouraging, and he was permitted eventually to dispose of his cargo. At the next meeting with the governor and intendant, through the aid of their respective secretaries as interpreters, Wilkinson gave them an extensive account of the conditions in Kentucky and explained his purposes in coming to New Orleans. These he promised to elaborate into a memorial.

The evidence, therefore, seems clear that the idea and essential features of the memorial, whether written or not in part before his arrival at New Orleans, emanated from Wilkinson, and not from the Spaniards. Gayarré,² however, following Clark,³ states that before Wilkinson came Miro had cherished the idea of employing him as an agent to effect the "secession of Kentucky, and of the other discontented districts from the rest of the United States"; but he does not observe that Clark had already contradicted himself when he affirms in the same document⁴ that Miro was "unacquainted with the American government" and "ignorant even of the position of Kentucky with respect to his own province". This ignorance on the part of Miro seems, furthermore, to be borne out by Gayarré's assertion,⁵ apparently following Marshall,⁶ that Miro requested Wilkinson "to give his sentiments freely in writing, respecting the political interests of Spain and the inhabitants of the United States dwelling in the regions upon the western waters". In his *Memoirs*⁷ Wilkinson says merely, "Governor Miro, the intendant Navarro, and our interpreters, were the only persons, to whom my most interesting propositions were communicated." Marshall furthermore intimates that Wilkinson himself was the originator of the Spanish intrigue. Says that author:⁸

It is believed, on hints and inuendoes of General Wilkinson, that he composed an essay on the commerce of the Mississippi. . . . soon Wilkinson was the "first and principal person who had destroyed the enterprise which Brigadier [George Rogers] Clark had had in mind against Natchez" in the spring of the same year. Wilkinson flatly denies Clark's further assertion, however, (*Memoirs*, II., Appendix V; *Proofs*, appendix, 105) that his uncle had introduced Wilkinson to the governor and other officials. He declares that his meeting with the elder Clark, with whom he had no previous acquaintance, took place the day after his arrival (*Memoirs*, II. 100).

¹ September 25, 1787.

² *Proofs*, appendix, 7-8.

³ *Louisiana*, III. 195.

⁴ II. 112.

⁵ *Louisiana*, 194.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Kentucky*, I. 321-322.

⁸ *Kentucky*, I. 321-322.

after he decided on seeking his fortune in the New Orleans market — that it was taken with him as no inconsiderable part of his cargo — and there, became a subject of conference, if not of barter. There should be no doubt, but that, the objects of the essay, were examined, and canvassed between him, and the intendant: whence they came to understand each other; and some estimate put upon its value; and that subsequently it was revised, with a view of its being sent to the court of Spain, as a first fruit of his Catholic Majesty's new subject. The essay which was read, had merit, for the views it combined, of the relative interests, of the countries on the waters of the Mississippi. . . . Its being addressed to the *intendant*, and sent to the Spanish court with Wilkinson's approbation, instead of its being addressed, and sent to congress, shew conclusively, the bias, and the aim of the author.

On the other hand, Wilkinson would rather give the impression that he had composed the formal "essay" in New Orleans. "I have wrote this Essay", he remarks in the memorial, "under hourly intrusions, daily engagements and various inconveniences." And finally, to quote Miro and Navarro themselves,¹ "He [Wilkinson] made us an extensive relation of all that the enclosed memorial contains, which he offered to work out, as in fact he has done."

The personal attractiveness of Wilkinson and his powers of persuasion soon created a certain amount of intimacy with the two Spaniards, considerably deeper on his part than on theirs.² The knowledge also that he had acquired meanwhile of the commercial restrictions imposed by the laws of the Indies, the influence of Miro and Navarro themselves, his own ambition and desire for gain, as well as perhaps the mere logic of the situation, all impressed him with the necessity of renouncing his allegiance to the United States, as a powerful means of furthering his projects. He accordingly took the oath that made him a Spanish subject.³ Its language, even in its Spanish dress, is so characteristically Wilkinsonian in style as to leave no reasonable doubt about the authenticity of the document.⁴ In translation it runs as follows:

Self-interest regulates the passions of nations as well as of individuals, and he who imputes a different motive to human conduct either deceives himself or endeavors to deceive others. Still, while I maintain this truth,

¹ To Valdes, September 25, 1787.

² Cf. below, pages 503, 505, and notes.

³ It is quite possible that Gayarré, Roosevelt, and other writers who have failed to state this fact doubted the information of Marshall, based as it was on the gossip of the time. Marshall in his *History of Kentucky*, I. 283, 312, speaking of Wilkinson after his return from New Orleans, says, "soon it was rumoured . . . that he was a Spanish subject; having taken the necessary oath of allegiance, etc. . . . He . . . was without offence, called a Spanish subject." The fact that Gayarré and Roosevelt do not mention this assertion of Marshall, however, may be due quite as much to the failure of Daniel Clark himself, with all his denunciations of the alleged corruption of Wilkinson, to assert anything worse than that the accused had received a pension from Spain.

⁴ See page 490, note.

I will not deny that every man owes something to the land in which he was born and educated. This something, in whatever form it appears, is founded on self-love; as for example, an Irishman in Spain, a Spaniard in France, a Frenchman in England, or an Englishman wherever he might be, would boastfully recount the virtues and renown of his respective nation, and would feel sorrow or vexation at any instance of its misfortune or dishonor; but to assert that an intelligent being, able to do as he sees fit, should plant himself like a vegetable that perchance was a witness of his birth, would be setting at naught the wisdom of Providence and condemning the universal practice of the human race.

When a person of distinction intends to expatriate himself, he ought to proceed with extreme caution and circumspection. He has to ponder well the obligations which subsist between him and his country, ascertaining dispassionately whether he is bound to its service by any tie of confidence, public, positive, or implicit. He ought to bear in mind that this resolution will wound the self-love of those whom he abandons, and consequently will expose his whole life and actions to the severest scrutiny, and his reputation and character to the shafts and flings of slander and calumny. Profoundly impressed with these important truths, laying aside every passion or prejudice, I call upon the reflection with which the goodness of God has endowed me and matured my decision in accordance with reason, honor, and conscience.

Having these principles, and holding to this opinion, I hope that no one can say of me with justice that I break any law of nature or of nations, of conscience or of honor, in transferring my allegiance, from the United States to his Catholic Majesty.¹

Born and educated in America, I embraced her cause in the recent revolution, and steadfastly I adhered to her interests until she triumphed over her enemy. This event, having rendered my services no longer needful, released me from my engagements, dissolved all the obligations, even those of nature, and left me at liberty, after having fought for her welfare, to seek my own. Since the circumstances and policy of the United States have rendered it impossible for me to attain this desired object under her government, I am resolved, without wishing them [the United States] any harm, to seek it in Spain, where I feel persuaded that my conduct will be directed by such principles of loyalty to my sovereign, and of justice to my fellow-subjects as will assure me tranquillity of conscience and bear my name untarnished to posterity.

Thus both the regard for my own good name, which I love infinitely more than my life, and that which I profess for you, gentlemen, [*i. e.*, Miro and Navarro], to whom I have the honor to apply, have led me to suppose that, whatever be my future lot, I may rely upon you both as repositories of my honor to bear witness to my principles, and that the motives of my conduct are the real advantage of the country in which I dwell as well as the interest and aggrandizement of the Spanish monarchy; in pledge of which I affix my signature, the twenty-second of August in the year of our Lord, 1787.

Although he had completed, the day before he made this statement, the elaboration of his earlier discourse before the governor and intendant into the momentous memorial, Wilkinson did not

¹ "Poseyendo estos principios, y abrazando esta opinion, espero que no se podrá decir de mi con justicia que quebranto ninguna ley de naturaleza ó naciones, de conciencia ó honor, en cambiar mi fidelidad de los Estados Unidos á su Majestad Católica."

formally present the same until September 5.¹ The first part of it is devoted to a portrayal of the dissatisfaction of the Kentuckians with the Congress of the Confederation. He emphasizes the rapid increase of population in the west, and their aggressive self-reliance as well. He observes:

In all Republics the execution of the Laws, from obvious causes, is lax, inert and vague; the Americans who pass the Mountains, and seat themselves at a great distance from the executive authority of their respective Governments, availing themselves of this principle, and complaining of the want of those commercial advantages, which their Brethren on the Atlantic enjoy, unitedly declare against taxation, nor can any Person be found among them who will attempt the execution of the Law on this Subject.

He then proceeds to show how incompetent the Congress was to handle the problems of the time, and avows his conviction that it will not procure for the Kentuckians the relief they desire; "the evident consequence of this", he says, "will be a distinct confederation of the western inhabitants." Independence once attained, however, he solemnly assures the Spanish officials that the Kentuckians would resort to any means whatever to gain the free navigation of the Mississippi—an "object on which all their hopes of temporal happiness rest, and without which misery and wretchedness is their certain portion". He further declares that overtures, if made, would first be extended to Spain, and that if they failed, the Kentuckians would ally themselves with Great Britain, and take by force what they could not get by negotiation. The reward of Great Britain would be Louisiana itself.

After a brief account of the machinations of Great Britain against Spain and the United States since the Revolution, he plunges into a discussion of "what ought to be the policy of the Spanish Court at this critical conjuncture", as he terms it. To this end he propounds the following queries:

1st Will it be practicable for us permanently to resist the claim *to the Navigation of the Mississippi* of the already powerful and increasing American settlements, west of the Apalachian Mountains, when aided by a respectable European Power? 2nd Will the resistance of this claim for a few years compensate the King for the expences he must incur thereby or may not this resistance produce consequences more injurious to the Spanish Monarchy than the loss of Louisiana altogether? 3rd Will it be most adviseable, by partial indulgence and an accommodating deportment to attach these settlements, and render them subservient to the interest of Spain, or by hostile restraints and rigorous exactions to drive them into the arms of Great Britain.

With a wealth of florid verbiage he deduces from the character

¹ Miro and Navarro to Wilkinson, September 6, 1787, Archivo Historico-Nacional, Estado, Legajo 3893 A.

and circumstances of the Kentuckians a distinct negative to the first two queries. Concerning the third he remarks:

If Spain drives the Americans into the arms of Great Britain she immediately endangers her Louisianian territories, and eventually her Mexican Provinces; on the contrary, if she attaches the Americans to her interest, she may immediately deduce a vast Revenue from the connexion and establish them a permanent barrier against Great Britain and the United States.

In this state of things his Excellency Don Diego de Gardoqui should without hesitation peremptorily and absolutely refuse to Congress the Navigation of the Mississippi, for should this Gentleman form a treaty, by which the Americans may become intitled to the independent enjoyment of this Navigation, he will destroy the power which Spain now enjoys over the American settlements, and entirely defeat our principal view; for it may be laid down as an absolute Fact that these Settlements will continue subordinate and look up for protection to that power which secures them this most precious privilege; let Spain then carefully preserve this right to herself, until she can employ it in exchange for such concessions as she may think proper to demand from the western settlers of America.

The prohibition of intercourse by the Mississippi with the Americans was highly judicious, inasmuch as it has preserved to Spain the power of conferring an inestimable favor (to be priced at her discretion) on a People who, had they been indulged in their claim of the Navigation without interruption, would have viewed Her as an equal, to whom they acknowledged no obligation; this prohibition should be still supported, *generally*, with as much rigor as ever, tho' in order to conciliate and prepare the Minds of the western Americans for the grand object of these speculations, it may be politic to relax in particular instances, and to offer indulgence to men of real influence; this conduct would attach the leading characters in that Country to the interest of Spain, would cheer the People with the hope of a free and friendly intercourse, and prevent every act of outrage and hostility: with these prepossessions the transition from the renouncement of the federal Government of America to a Negotiation with the Court of Spain would be natural and immediate.

At this point Spain should rest, and patiently wait the advances of the Americans, but it seems absolutely indispensable that the powers of Government here should be so far enlarged as to authorize the governing officers to treat with the Agent or Agents who may be sent down by the Americans on the leading principles of the connexion, which will both facilitate and expedite the business; the overture being made by the Americans, Spain will have the Game in her own hands, and as it will doubtless be played by heads much abler than my own it would be presumptuous in me to offer my sentiments on the subject at this time; I will therefore only observe that I shall be ready to give my feeble assistance at all times, and that I am persuaded the negotiation may be so conducted as to secure to Spain every advantage¹ she can wish from the

¹ Cf. Wilkinson's *Memoirs*, II. 114-115: "But, that I have ever, in all my correspondence and intercourse with the Spanish government, conceded a title of the honour or interests of my own country, I most solemnly deny, in the face of God and man; and I have ample and undeniable testimony to shew that I omitted no occasion, to employ my ascendancy over the officers of Spanish Louisiana, to render them subservient to the interest, and accommodation of the United States."

connexion, without involving her in any dispute with the United States. Spain claims and commands the navigation of the Mississippi which she may dispense to such part of the United States and on such Conditions as her Policy or inclination may direct; and if any part of the United States should violate the federal pact or the Laws of the union, to obtain this Blessing, it must be the violators, and not the Spanish Court who stand answerable to Congress. In this case Spain will be tacit, and the Americans only will act.

But after all, should this splendid plann be defeated by any circumstance, at present unforeseen and unexpected, I am decidedly of opinion, that the following system of policy and defence will have the strongest tendency to give security to Louisiana, and bids fair, ultimately to produce the Event which we have under contemplation.

He then recommends, as a military and political precaution, the establishment of a fortified post at a trading-station called *L'Ance à la Graise*¹ (sic), some miles below the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi, urging the measure as follows:

On strict military principles it is necessary for the immediate defence of the Province, and in a political view it is necessary because, in any negotiation which may hereafter take place between Spain and the western Americans, the more respectable and independent the military strength of the former, the greater will be the concessions she will receive from the latter. . . . this Post once established, Spain may admit the settlement of Americans in Louisiana and Florida with safety, tho' I think the former should be encouraged because the soil is preferable, and the measure will tend to alienate and eradicate american principles and connexions; it should be an invariable maxim not to admit any Person to residence who did not bring with him visible property, or could not give ample security for his good behaviour in the penalty of confiscation: the oath of allegiance should be universally exacted, but as Religion depends on Faith and internal conviction, the first settlers should be left free and unfettered in this respect. . . . Churches should be erected at the public expence and Priests of Piety, Philanthropy and address, who well understand the English Language, habits, and manners should be established in these settlements, not only to propound the holy Gospel, but to educate the rising generation, every other public worship being suppressed; first the forms and then the principles of the ancient Religion would be adopted: Nor should the military and civil jurisdiction in these settlements be less strictly regarded, it should be comited to Men of liberal Minds and enlarged understanding, who could speak the English Language, and for the occasion would sacrifice every Idea of private Interest; under such an administration an american would look back with disgust to the caprice of the Government he had abandoned, and, finding himself in the free and secure enjoyment of his property, without taxation, he would become attached to the Government of Spain, by the indissoluble Bonds of Interest and affection. —

This plann, as beneficent as it is political, would produce immediate consequences highly important to Spain, for the early adventurers having reported to their Brethren, whom they left behind, the mildness and equity of the Government, the fertility of the soil, the advantage of the Markets, and above all their exemption from taxation, the emigration

¹ Later New Madrid.

from Kentucky and other American settlements would be as rapid to Louisiana as it ever was from the Atlantic States to the Western Country; this Province would then rise into immediate Wealth, Strength and National importance. — the very same considerations, therefore, which dispose the United States to resist the population of the western Country should dictate a contrary policy to Spain, for commanding, as she does, the only avenue to exportation, when this vast and luxuriant country becomes populated, she will be able to derive from commercial imposts alone a Revenue more certain and perhaps equal to that of South America.¹

After this disquisition on the proper policy for Spain to pursue, Wilkinson explains the motives or, as he calls them, "the grounds and objects" of his visit—by far the most important part of the memorial:

Know then, that the leading characters of Kentucky, the place of my residence, impatient under the inconveniences and distress which they suffer from the restraints on their commerce, urged and intreated my voyage hither, in order to develop if possible the disposition of Spain towards their Country, and to discover, if practicable, whether she would be willing to open a negotiation for our admission *to her protection as subjects*, with certain privileges in political and religious matters, consonant to the Genius and necessary to the happiness of the present generation; these privileges would have been specifically defined, and I should have borne a written Commission, had not Kentucky (tho' on the eve of establishing herself a free and independent state) still appertained and continued subordinate to the commonwealth of Virginia; but as I have heretofore observed, I am persuaded the People of this District, so soon as they have organized a Government of their own, will make a formal application to the court of Spain on the subject just mentioned; and as I am convinced their happiness, as well as the peace of Louisiana, depends upon the success of this application, I shall take much pleasure in employing all my faculties to compass this desirable event,² and for such consideration, as my services may be deemed to merit.

Should this proffer be embraced I shall hold myself in readiness to receive the instructions of Government and to return by the safest and speediest Route to Kentucky, having previously established a confidential correspondent near the seat of Congress, who shall transmit me regularly every act of that Body which can in any shape affect the subject before us.

¹ Wilkinson's memory is at fault when he declares (*Memoirs*, II. 112-113) that he presented at this time an "extensive scheme of colonization" (cf. above, page 493). He did not offer it until September 17, 1789, in a letter, or rather a second memorial, to Miro, after he had learned of the decision of the Spanish government, November 20, 1788, on the general propositions submitted in his first memorial. Archivo Historico-Nacional, Estado, Legajo 3898 B.

² Cf. Wilkinson's statement in his *Memoirs*, II. 113: "The idea of alienating Kentucky from the United States, while a prospect of national protection remained, would have been as absurd, as the idea of reducing them to the vassallage of Spain. Such a proposition would have been so vain and chimerical, that no man, whose interest it was, to preserve a consistency of character with the Spanish government, would have ventured to hazard it. Indeed, the monstrous extravagance of the thought, is too ludicrous for grave consideration, and could never have originated, with any person who understood the character, genius, and government of the people of the United States."

When I return to Kentucky, if my propositions are embraced in the answer which I may receive to this address, I shall forthwith proceed though with cautious deliberation to exert my political weight and influence to familiarize and recommend to the Body of the People among whom I live those views which constitute the design of my present voyage, and which have already fixed the attention of the discerning part of that Community, and I will engage constantly to transmit to his Excellency the Governor by trusty Couriers employed for the purpose (who are to be paid by this Government for the hazard and fatigue of the journey) a particular representation of every measure which I may adopt in this important business, as well as every proceeding of Congress interesting to our views and the effects either may produce on the subject. I hope, however, that I shall not [be] condemned for attempting at the same time that I am labouring to advance a Work which may lead to the aggrandizement of Spain, and the prosperity of thousands, to provide for the safety and happiness of my own Family. For this purpose, and to give the strongest assurance of the sincerity of my professions I humbly pray that I may be permitted to transmit to an Agent in this City in Negroes, live Stock, tobacco, Flour, Bacon, Lard, Butter, Cheese tallow, Apples the amount of fifty or sixty thousand Dollars, cost of Kentucky, which articles may be sold for my account, and the proceeds held by his Excellency the Governor, as a pledge for my good conduct until the issue of our plans is known, or I have fixed my residence in Louisiana.¹

In conclusion, Wilkinson hints at the probability that, if the scheme succeeded, the other western settlements would speedily imitate Kentucky by enrolling themselves under the protection of Spain. He declares, however, that the success in question depends upon "the most inviolable secrecy";² the continuance of Miro in his present office, and the appointment of Navarro as minister to the "American Court":

This Gentleman fixed near Congress, from his knowledge of the Subject, would be able to seize every occasion to advance our views and by this arrangement we should be able to establish a direct communication from Congress thro' the western Country and by Louisiana to the Court.

He terminates the memorial³ as follows:

Pardon, Gentlemen, these reflections, they are dictated by a conviction of their utility, and by my zeal in the cause in which I have engaged. to you, Gentlemen, I have committed secrets of an important nature, such as would, were they divulged destroy my Fame and Fortune for-

¹ "The general has acknowledged to the author of these remarks, that he originally contemplated removing to Natchez, and did favour the policy of the court of Spain, at that time, to populate that district with emigrants from the United States, for motives too obvious to name." "A Plain Tale," etc., in Clark's *Proofs*, appendix, 5.

² "My transactions were confined to Governor Miro, and Intendant Navarro, and of course were secret; which necessarily gave room for every idle conjecture, which whim might suggest or malice dictate." Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, II. 116.

³ Appended to this document are a list and a map of fourteen settlements made by the "vassals of the United States along the rivers or creeks which discharge their waters into the Ohio." The names given are: Alleghany, Monongahela, Tiger's Valley, Green River, New River, Blue Stone, River Holston, French Broad River, Tennessee, Clinck's River, Powell's River, Kentucky, Cumberland River, and the County of Illinois.

ever. But I feel the strongest confidence in your silence and discretion, and if the plan should eventually be rejected by the Court, I must rely on the candor and high honor of a dignified Minister to bury these communications in eternal oblivion.

On the day after Wilkinson had presented the memorial Miro and Navarro sent him a formal reply.¹ In it they granted, as a proof of the confidence his propositions had inspired, the right to send from Kentucky a consignment of tobacco, negroes, cattle, swine, and apples, though not to exceed half of the sum he had suggested.² The proceeds therefrom were to be deposited in the provincial treasury as agreed until the king of Spain should signify his pleasure in the matter.³ They promised to recommend his proposals in their

¹ Miro and Navarro to Wilkinson, September 6, 1787, Archivo Historico-Nacional, Estado, Legajo 3893 A.

² Gayarré, therefore, is misleading when he states (*Louisiana*, III. 195) that on the occasion of this first visit Miro gave Wilkinson "permission to introduce into Louisiana, free of duty, many western articles of trade which were adapted to its market". Marshall (*Kentucky*, 283), followed by later writers, including Roosevelt (*Winning of the West*, III. 126), observes: "It was rumoured that he [Wilkinson] had made a contract with the Spanish governor, which enabled him to ship tobacco, and deposit it in the king's store, at ten dollars per hundred. . . . He . . . let it be known that he had an exclusive privilege at New Orleans." Wilkinson, it is true, may have secured from the Spanish officials at this time special rights of trade, in addition to those conceded in the formal permission of September 6, 1787. But there are several reasons to believe the contrary. Among them may be mentioned first, aside from the proverbial caution of the Spanish officials (cf. below, p. 505 note 1), the fact that the laws of the Indies prohibited the grant of commercial privileges to foreigners without the specific approval of the home government. In the second place, the Spanish colonial officials were accustomed to render the most minute reports on their administration, particularly if the business belonged to the reserved or secret class; but, in their presentation of Wilkinson's projects, they allude to no concession beyond the one cited above. With the terms of this concession, furthermore, Wilkinson's own statement (*Memoirs*, II. 115) coincides almost precisely: "I obtained, in the first instance, a permit from Governor Miro, to introduce to the market of New Orleans, thirty-five thousand dollars worth of the produce of Kentucky." Indeed, Wilkinson's more extensive privileges, be it said, date from the second permit, August 8, 1788 (*Ibid.*, 116). Whatever he may have seen fit to give out in regard to his concession when he reappeared in Kentucky was no more than a mixture of personal vainglory with the Spanish propaganda for the promotion of his own pecuniary interests.

³ When the first consignment from Kentucky arrived at New Orleans, the following spring, Abner Dunn, who was in charge of it, had instructions from Wilkinson to ask Miro for an immediate payment of the proceeds from the sale, instead of leaving them in the provincial treasury. As a reason for this favor he pleaded that he could thus cancel a debt of 3,000 dollars contracted during his stay in New Orleans, and pay the boatmen their wages, as well as pay the owners of the shipment for what was due them on the tobacco, which he had purchased on credit. The surplus, furthermore, would enable him to meet other obligations without loss, and hence would conveniently stimulate and enlarge his influence in the Kentucky region. "I have determined to gratify him on this occasion", writes Miro to Valdes, June 15, 1788 (Archivo Historico-Nacional, Est., Leg. 3893 A), ". . . for, if we compare the mischief that might arise from vexing him, and the impediments that the lack of money would doubtless put in the way of his operations, with the greater security we might have in keeping his money in the treasury", he believes the advantage would lie clearly in dispensing with the former stipulation.

report to the home government, and said in conclusion, "Although we are not authorized to grant the favors asked, we are persuaded that his Majesty will heed the reasons . . . in the memorial . . . which fact you can make known to the prominent men and the other inhabitants of the district for their satisfaction and hope."

Before his departure Wilkinson arranged with the Spanish officials to carry on a correspondence in "one of the most incomprehensible of ciphers,"¹ in order to be able, say Miro and Navarro,² "to give us the news which this delicate subject may call forth". He sailed from New Orleans for the Ohio by way of Philadelphia, September 16, "very enthusiastic over his task of preparing the minds [of the Kentuckians] for the attainment of the first project",³ i. e., of procuring their subjection to Spain.

In their report⁴ on the memorial the governor and intendant accept as unquestionable the alternatives deduced from Wilkinson's reasoning, namely, the loss of Louisiana—the natural barrier of Mexico—or the adoption of one of the two projects he offers. They descant upon the obvious advantages of the acquisition of Kentucky as an additional bulwark of Mexico, and request their superiors for instructions in dealing with any commissioners who might come from the Ohio region. These instructions should relate to the extent of religious liberty to be allowed the new subjects or settlers, the amount of tobacco to be purchased from them on account of the crown, the scope of their commercial privileges, and the sort of administration to be established among them. The realization of the scheme to annex the western settlements, however, the governor and intendant regard as quite remote, depending as it did upon the action of Congress. On the other hand, the project for encouraging colonization from the Ohio region they felt was immediately practicable, and did not preclude the acceptance of the more radical one whenever the contingency might arise.

¹ Says Wilkinson through the medium of "A Plain Tale", Clark's *Proofs*, appendix, 5, "On the general's first engagement a cypher was formed, more for the security of the communication of his friend, than his own."

² To Valdes, September 25, 1787.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ This document of course belonged to the class of official correspondence marked "reserved by preference". Its joint composition and signature by the governor and intendant show its highly important character. It happened to bear the number 13 in the series. See Gayarré, *Louisiana*, III. 212. This was the origin of the numeral by which Wilkinson was known in his later communications with the Spanish authorities. Archivo Historico-Nacional, Est., Leg. 5564 B. Casa Calvo to Cevallos, March 30, 1804: "El mismo sugeto conocido bajo la indicación del No. 13, cuyo guarismo señaló la representación dirigida al Sor. Bailio Fr. Dn. Antonio Valdes por el gobernador é intendente de estas provincias con fecha de 25 de Setiembre de 1787, ha puesto en mis manos la carta", etc.

The fact that Wilkinson was willing to allow the proceeds from his commercial venture to be placed temporarily in deposit until "the course of his schemes should be perceived", or until he could take up his residence in Louisiana, seemed to obviate any suspicion that he had wished to delude the Spaniards with "grandiose undertakings as a means of realizing a profitable commercial speculation".¹ The well-known circumstances, moreover, of the western country and the quasi-anarchy in the government of the United States apparently substantiated the sincerity of Wilkinson's overtures. Capable as he was of "making the settlers of that region adopt on a critical occasion any procedure he may elect", Miro and Navarro recommended that his energy be stimulated by the approval of their concession of half the amount of imports asked, and by the admission of the other half as well. In either case the goods should come in free of duty. "But, while for the present, the favors should extend no further", write the two officials, "it might be well to have his Majesty signify to Wilkinson that he will be rewarded generously for his services if he succeeds in the first and principal project, or brings all his influence to bear in the accomplishment of the second." They express a desire also to know whether other influential men in Kentucky, as Wilkinson advises, should be given a like privilege of commerce with, however, the imposition of a six per cent. duty.

"In order that the excessive curiosity of the prominent men of this capital may be confined to a single object", conclude the governor and intendant, "we have insinuated that Wilkinson came as a commissioner of the settlements [along the Ohio] to solicit a general permission to send down their produce . . . the good effect of which is that nobody has imagined anything else." This clever arrangement, whereby an ostensibly innocent commercial transaction for the benefit of Wilkinson and the Kentuckians concealed a plot to sever the west from the Union, deprived those who suspected his motives from the outset of anything more effective than surmise and conjecture. Nevertheless his contemporary Marshall doggedly asserts:

These documents, present to the mind two distinct engagements into which General Wilkinson . . . entered, at Orleans: one with the government, by which he . . . obtained the exclusive privilege of trading to that port; and to obtain which he . . . used means, not *necessary*, nor

¹ In his letter to Valdes, June 15, 1788 (Archivo Historico-Nacional, Est., Leg. 3893 A), Miro remarks that, while he believed that Wilkinson was doing a considerable amount of work for the cause, it was possible, nevertheless, that his design was to enrich himself at the mere cost of bolstering up Spanish hopes of advantage, while he knew all along that the scheme was futile.

obligatory, nor HONOURABLE,¹ to be disclosed; — the other, merely commercial, and which as usual, was committed to a formal contract. This double plot, it was, which perplexed the best informed men in Kentucky, at that day — as the clandestine, and dishonourable part, was carefully concealed from all but coadjutors; and that which was ostensible, enabled Wilkinson to carry on his political intrigue for many years; and finally to escape the punishment, due to his perfidy — to the no small emolument of himself and others; and to the very great annoyance of better, and honester men.²

But neither such assertions as these nor the damaging testimony of Clark's *Proofs* sufficed to establish the whole truth as to what happened during Wilkinson's first visit to New Orleans.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

¹ Quoted from Wilkinson's mouthpiece in "A Plain Tale" (Clark's *Proofs*, appendix, 5): "It is neither necessary, nor obligatory, nor would it be honourable to detail the means he employed to effect this object [*i. e.*, procuring for "his fellow citizens in the west . . . the invaluable advantages of a free trade with New Orleans"] it will suffice to say that his country was accommodated and benefited by his enterprise, and that his personal speculations, in their nature politically innocent, were directed to the friendly correspondence, harmonious intercourse, and reciprocal interests of the two countries."

² *Kentucky*, I. 313.

THE WORLD ASPECTS OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

ARGUMENT by title is a very attractive form of fallacy. We therefore freely confess that it is rather a thesis we have to establish than a theme to unfold when we speak of the Louisiana purchase as a decisive epoch of general history and of American history in particular. Moreover, there is a sense in which every moment throughout the comparatively short duration of recorded history is a decisive one: in the pursuit of that idea the verge between sound, solemn truth and fanciful fiction is but a razor-edge.

Yet by common consent some men and some events are epochal. Carefully scrutinized, such men and such events are known by very definite qualities. There are times when the great central current has few lagoons, no back-water, and never an eddy. The whole substance of history is thrown into a single channel, affording a notable example of the unity of history and compelling its study by transverse sections rather than by longitudinal fibers. The man of such a period is fairly certain to be preëminently busy, so diligent, so comprehensive, so perspicacious as to be for the duration of his activity and ability an indispensable person, the man of his age. He is literally and etymologically a governor, for he steers the bark of state alike on the convexity of the swift and swollen tide, and in the hollowing current of a falling flood.

Such a decisive epoch was that of the eighteenth-century revolutions, a crisis reached after long, slow preparation, precipitated by social and religious bigotry, dizzy in its consummation, wild and headlong in its flight, precipitous in its crash. Of this important time the results have been so permanent that they are the common-places of contemporary history; in what Carlyle called the revolutionary loom the warp and woof were spun from the past, and the fabric is that from which our working clothes are cut. Moreover, within those years appeared the great dominating soul of modern humanity, who displayed first and last every weakness and every sordid meanness of mankind, but in such giant dimensions that even his depravity inspires awe. His virtues were equally portentous because they worked on the grand scale, with materials that had been threshed and winnowed in the theory and experience of five genera-

tions of mankind. It was well within this stupendous age and by the act of this representative man that Louisiana was redeemed from Spanish misrule and incorporated with the territories of the United States. Nor was this all. A careful examination of the general political situation just a hundred years ago will exhibit the elemental and almost ultimate fact that the sale of Louisiana was coincident with the turn of the age. It is to this exhibit and to some reflections on its meaning that we address ourselves.

The substance of the treaty of Amiens was that Great Britain ostensibly abandoned all concern with the continent of Europe, and that France, ostensibly too, should strictly mind her own affairs in her colonies and the remoter quarters of the globe. George III. removed from his escutcheon the fleur-de-lis, and from his ceremonial title the style of king of France. The whole negotiation was on both sides purely diplomatic, an exchange of public and hollow courtesies, to gain time for the realities of a struggle for supremacy between the world powers of the period, a struggle begun with modern history, renewed in 1688, and destined to last until the exhaustion of one of the contestants in 1815. Neither party to the treaty had the slightest intention of observing either its spirit or its letter. While the paper was in process of negotiation Bonaparte was consolidating French empire on the continent, and after its signature he did not pause for a single instant to show even a formal respect for his obligations. The reorganization of Holland in preparation for its incorporation into the French system, the annexation of Piedmont and defiance to Russia in the matter of her Italian protégés, the Act of Moderation in Switzerland, and finally the contemptuous rearrangement of Germany were successive steps which reduced England to despair for her continental trade. To her it seemed as if there could be no question about two things: first, that the old order must be restored, in order to safeguard her commercial safety; and second, that her colonial policy must be more aggressive than ever.

A favorite charge of Napoleon's detractors is that he left France without a colonial empire. This was due to no absence of either aspirations or efforts. His earliest passion, his mature intention, his latest yearnings were for a French colonial empire. This was true, because there was not one item of the great political creed formulated by Richelieu to which he did not consider himself the heir; oriental aspirations, western ventures and explorations, the dominance of France in the tropic seas, around the globe, were articles of that creed. It had been therefore no slight blow to his personal ambition when he failed in Egypt. Turkey was still safe under the

protection of Great Britain, and the highway to India was still in British hands. Almost without a moment's hesitancy, he turned his forces westward and formed the majestic design of a second New France around the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and eventually with a mighty wing toward South America. This adjunct became the chief corner-stone of the policy when, after its initial failure, he had a chance to renew it in 1808 by Sassenay's mission to Argentina.

Simultaneously he had come to terms with Paul of Russia, and with him he negotiated a grandiose treaty providing for a great land expedition against Hindustan. Each power was to furnish 35,000 men and a corps of scholars; the march was to be a colonization of the wilderness, and the wealth of the East Indies was to be the reward. Paul died by violence just as his army was crossing the Volga on the ice in March, 1801, and Alexander, his more or less blood-guilty but philosophic heir, put a stop to further procedure. A curious chapter of England's resistance to the French Revolution is that for which Lord Wellesley furnished the subject-matter in his campaign against Tippoo Sahib, then in alliance with a mighty band of French adventurers, who, though royalists, were willing to stand and fight for French supremacy in India. To this long and gallant struggle the treaty of Amiens was an extinguisher, for it restored the five French cities to Bonaparte. Decaen, the noted and boasting Anglophobe, had demanded a mission to India on the very morrow of Hohenlinden; less than a month after the signatures were affixed at Amiens he was despatched to occupy the French towns of Pondicherry, now to be restored. But with an expedition of 1,600 men he had the monstrous disproportion of seven generals and a corresponding mass of minor officers. Clearly he was to reorganize the whole French force of India. Wellesley refused to execute the treaty, and Decaen was forced back on the French settlements of Réunion as a base from which to await developments. Hindu troops were drilled, reorganized, and found thoroughly trustworthy; a detachment of them had even been sent to Egypt, where they had some slight share in the retention of British control. It was Bonaparte's rôle to present a dauntless front to his foes, whatever his inner discouragement and hesitancy. Accordingly he despatched the notorious Sebastiani as a so-called commercial agent to examine the situation in the Levant. The result was a report giving an exact account of all the English and Turkish forces beyond the Adriatic, and drawing the highly pertinent conclusion that 6,000 French soldiers could reconquer Egypt. When this stinging insult was published by the First Consul in the *Moniteur*, the British world was worried into open defiance.

From this rapid survey there emerge the important facts essential to our discussion. It was surely a turning-point in the history of the civilized world, so far as Asia was concerned, when Bonaparte's oriental designs were permanently thwarted, when Russia was forced into an eastward expansion north of the great central mountain ridge of Asia to become a hyperborean power, when England defiantly claimed for the first time all Hindustan as her own. It wrote "finis" to the chapter of France's glory in India and indeed to the story of her Asiatic aspirations: her far eastern colonies seized under the present republic are comparatively insignificant factories, which she holds on the sufferance of the European concert, and for which she would not defy the world a single moment, as she would defy it to the spilling of her heart's blood should her present African empire be menaced.

Again, the situation was a turning-point of the first importance in Africa. In consequence of the desire of both contracting parties to catch their breath, Egypt was restored to Turkey, and the Cape Colony was to be a free port, a no-man's-land; Malta, which is an African isle, was to be returned to the Knights of St. John. The theory was that not one Christian power, continental or insular, was to hold a coign of vantage as regards the dark continent. Russia, to be sure, was jealous for Malta; England and France, for Egypt and the Cape; they might remain so, but that was all. Of course we are familiar with the late partitions of Africa among the powers, the coast and *hinterland* arrangements which bid fair to become permanent occupations. Had it not been for the compulsory suspension of Bonaparte's oriental plans, the retention by England both of India and of the Indian highway through the Mediterranean, and the confirmation of this situation by the evolution of affairs across the Atlantic which culminated in the sale of Louisiana to us, the fate of Africa, humanly speaking, would, like that of Asia, have been far different in every single respect.

What was written for Europe in the book of fate was soon revealed. No one could prate more serenely about destiny than General Bonaparte, nor scrutinize more quizzically the sibylline leaves. But like the augurs of old, he could scarcely retain his mirth when he announced the oracle, nor keep his body from shaking with laughter while the feigned fury of passion was distorting the features of his face in frenzied anger. The treaty of Amiens was negotiated subject to guaranties from the other powers, and Addington well knew that Russia was going to fish in the troubled waters of neutrality for the leviathan of her disappearing prosperity. So the English refused to evacuate Malta. The Whitworth scene is one of

Napoleon Bonaparte's finest dramatic rôles, and the delivery of his line, "I would rather see England in the Faubourg St. Antoine than in Malta", a climax of theatrical statesmanship. It is by no means sure that he might not have seen the British sail away both from Alexandria and Valetta, that he might not have received in delivery the cities of Pondicherry, that he might not have confirmed his American empire, had he been willing to grant Great Britain a commercial treaty that would have turned her stores of manufactured goods into hard cash, have relieved the awful financial strain under which she was tortured, and have given her the full advantage of her long precedence in the industrial revolution. But no. By the treaty of Morfontaine, September 30, 1800, with the United States, he arranged to strip us of all Mississippi trade and thus tardily execute the policy of our isolation on this continent, which Vergennes had vainly sought to embody in the public law of Europe. Soon he began to close the ports of France and her allies more firmly than ever to British goods, hoping under the protective system to give France a chance in the race for industrial supremacy. The English were aghast, and in their grim determination to renew what they felt was a struggle for life and death they broke off diplomatic relations, and war began. This outcome was inevitable, but it was too soon for Bonaparte. His versatility was sorely strained to settle finally on his policy.

It was Samuel Adams who first sneered at his fatherland as a people of shopkeepers. The winged word soon became a commonplace to all outsiders, but as it flew every nation that used the gibe girded itself to enter the struggle for the same goal. France above all was determined to be a nation of shopkeepers, and the First Consul of what was still a shaky experiment in government knew well that rather than abandon that ambition, he must sacrifice every other. After all, a colonial empire has value only as the home nation has accessible ports, manufactories for colonial products, and wares to exchange with the producers. France had neither factories nor manufactures, and was destitute of nearly the whole machinery of exchange. Her merchant vessels sailed only by grace of the British fleet. Her home market was dependent on British traders even in times of war. Bonaparte's foremost thought, therefore, was for concentration of energy. The sea-power of the world was Britain's, and her tyranny of the seas without a real check; even the United States could only spit out defiant and revengeful threats when her merchantmen were treated with contempt on the high seas by British men-of-war. Therefore with swift and comprehensive grasp he framed and announced a new policy. The

French envoy in London was informed that France was now forced to the conquest of Europe—this of course for the stimulating of French industries—and to the restoration of her occidental empire. This was most adroit. The embers of French patriotism could be fanned into a white heat by these well-worn but never exhausted expedients—a blast against perfidious Albion and a sentimental passion for the New France beyond the Atlantic. The motions were a feint against England by the formation of a second camp at Boulogne, where a force really destined for Austria was assembled, and the wresting of Louisiana from the weak Spanish hands which held it. As an incident of the agitation it seemed best that the French democracy should have an imperial rather than a republican title, and the style of emperor and empire was exhumed from the garbage heap of the Terror for use in the pageantry of a court.

In Europe thus, as in the neighboring continents, the rearrangement of politics, territorial boundaries, social, economic, and diplomatic relations, a change which has made possible the modern system, was really dependent on the events which led to the adoption of the policy just described. But this policy involved a reversal of every sound historical principle in Bonaparte's plans. For twelve years longer he was to commit blunder upon blunder; to trample on national pride; to elevate a false system of political economy into a fetish; to conduct, as in the Moscow campaign, great migrations to the eastward in defiance of nature's laws; to launch his plain, not to say vulgar and weak, family on an enterprise of monarchical alliances for which they had no capacity; to undo, in short, as far as in him lay, every beneficent and well-conceived piece of statesmanship with which he had so far been concerned. It has been well said that had he died in midsummer, 1802, his glory would have been immaculate and there would have been no spots on his sun. The Napoleonic work in Europe was destined to have its far-reaching and permanent results, but the man was ere long almost entirely eliminated from control over them. The very last of his great constructions was the sale of Louisiana. He needed the purchase-money, he selected his purchaser and forced it on him, with a view to upbuilding a giant rival to the gigantic power of Great Britain.

When we turn therefore to America, we shall at once observe on how slender a thread a great event may depend, how great a fire may be kindled by a spark adroitly placed. While yet other matters were hanging in the balance, he selected his own brother-in-law, General Leclerc, such was his deep concern, to conduct an expedition to the West Indies. There were embarked 35,000 men, and these the very flower of the republican armies, superb fighters, but a

possible thorn in the side of a budding emperor at home. Their goal was San Domingo, where a wonderful negro, Toussaint L'Ouverture, noting the attractive example of the benevolent despots in Europe, had, under republican forms, not only abolished slavery, but had made himself a beneficent dictator. The fine but delicate structure of his negro state was easily crushed to the earth, but the fighting was fierce and prolonged, the climate and the pest were enabled to inaugurate and complete a work of slaughter more baleful than that of war, and two-thirds of the French invaders, including the commander and fifteen of his generals, fell victims to the yellow fever. The French were utterly routed, the sorry remnant sailed away, and the blacks fell into the hands of the worthless tyrant Dessalines, whose misrule killed the germs of order planted by Toussaint. One of our historians thinks this check of France by black soldiers to have been a determinative factor in American history, for thereafter there could be no question of a Gulf and Caribbean empire for France. Louisiana, he indicates, became at once a superfluous dependency, costly and annoying. This is a far-fetched contention: great as have been the services of the negro to the United States since he first fought on the battle-field of Monmouth under Washington, the failure of France in San Domingo was not through the sword of the blacks, but was an act of God through pestilence.

The circumstances that forced Louisiana upon the United States, then a petty power with revenues and expenditures far smaller than those of the Philippine Islands at this moment, arose from Napoleon's European necessities. The cession from Spain included all that Spain had received from France, the whole Gulf coast from St. Mary's to the Rio Grande, and the French pretensions not only northwestward to the Rockies but to the Pacific. The return made to Spain was the insignificant kingdom of Etruria and a solemn pledge that, should the First Consul fail in his promise, Louisiana in its fullest extent was to be restored to Spain. France therefore might not otherwise alienate it to any power whatever. The exacting and suspicious spirit shown both by Charles IV. and his contemptible minister Godoy, Prince of the Peace, had exasperated Bonaparte beyond endurance. The Spanish Bourbons were doomed by him to the fate of their kinsfolk in France; a pledge to a vanishing phantom of royalty was of small account. It was during the delay created by the punctilio of Godoy that the failure of the San Domingo expedition extinguished all hope of making Louisiana the sole entrepôt and staple of supplies for the West Indies. And simultaneously it grew evident that the truce negotiated at Amiens as a treaty could not last much longer, that either France must endure

the humiliation of seeing her profits therefrom utterly withheld, or herself declare war, or goad Great Britain into a renewal of hostilities. This last, as is well known, was the alternative chosen by Napoleon.

Our government had been in despair. The establishment of French empire in the West Indies would have destroyed our lucrative trade with the islands. It was trying enough that a feeble power like Spain should command the outlet of the Mississippi basin, but intolerable that such a mastery of the continent should fall into the hands of a strong and magisterial power like France. We were in dismay, even after the departure of the French from San Domingo. Bonaparte, however, was scarcely less disturbed; for Jefferson, despite his avowed Gallicism, spiritedly declared both to the First Consul and to Livingston, our minister to Paris, that the occupation of Louisiana by the great French force organized to that end could only result in an alliance of the two English-speaking nations which would utterly banish the French flag from the high seas. Bonaparte preserved an outward calm for those about him and went his way apparently unperturbed. But inwardly his mind seethed and without long delay he took his choice between the courses open to him. It was the first exhibition to himself and his family of the imperial despot soon to be known as Napoleon I., Emperor of the French. If Britain was the tyrant of the seas, he would be despot of the land. To French empire he would reduce Germany, Italy, and Spain in subjection, and with all the maritime resources of the continent at his back he would first shut every important port to English commerce, and then with allied and dependent fleets at his disposal try conclusions with the British behemoth for liberty of the seas and a new colonial empire. By the second camp at Boulogne and the occupation of Hanover Napoleon threw England into panic, while simultaneously he began the creation of his grand imperial army and thereby menaced Austria, the greatest German power, in her coalition with Russia, Sweden, Naples, and Great Britain. The latter, he was well aware, could face a hostile demonstration on her front with courage, if not with equanimity; and he determined to add a double stroke—to gain a harvest of gold and on her rear to strengthen her exasperated transatlantic sea-rival by selling Louisiana to the United States.

That determination was the turning-point in his career, just as the sudden wheel and about-face of the splendid force at Boulogne, when he hurled it across Europe at Vienna, displayed at last the turning-point in his policy. His brother Lucien had been an influential negotiator with Spain and plumed himself on the acquisition

of the great domain which had been for long the brightest jewel in the crown of France. His brother Joseph had negotiated the treaty of Amiens as a step preparatory to regaining a magnificent colonial empire for his country, an empire of which an old and splendid French possession was to be the corner-stone. Both were stunned and then infuriated when they learned their brother's resolution, sensations which were intensified to fury when they heard him announce that he would work his will in spite of all constitutional checks and balances. There is no historic scene more grotesque than that depicted by Lucien in his memoirs when he and Joseph undertook to oppose Napoleon. The latter was luxuriating in his morning bath on April 7, 1803, in the Tuileries when the brothers were admitted. After a long and intimate talk on general politics the fateful subject was finally broached by Napoleon, as he turned from side to side and wallowed in the perfumed water. Neither of the brothers could control his feelings, and the controversy grew hot and furious from minute to minute until Joseph, leaning over the tub, roared threats of opposition and words of denunciation. Brother Napoleon, lifting himself half-way to the top, suddenly fell back and clenched his arguments by splashing a full flood in the face and over the body of Joseph, drenching him to the skin. A valet was summoned, entered, and, paralyzed by the fury of the scene, fell in a dead faint. New aid was called and, the fires of passion being slaked for the time, the conflict ended until Napoleon and Joseph were decently clothed, when it was renewed in the office of the secretary Bourrienne. Ere long hot words were again spoken, violent language was succeeded by violent gestures, until at last Napoleon in a theatrical rage dashed his snuff-box on the floor, and the contestants separated. Disjointed and fierce as was the stormy argument, it revealed the whole of the imperial policy as we have stated it.

Meanwhile events in America, if not so picturesque and majestic, were equally tempestuous. The peace policy of Jefferson was rapidly going to pieces in the face of a westward menace, the Federalists were jubilant, and in the Senate James Ross, of Pennsylvania, called for war. When the intendant of Spain at New Orleans denied Americans the storage rights they had enjoyed in that city since 1795, the French politics of the President fell into general disrepute and contempt, for men reasoned *a fortiori*, if such things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? It mattered not that Spain's highest official, the governor, disavowed the act, the fire was in the stubble. The intendant was stubborn and the fighting temper waxed hot. Both the governor and the Spanish envoy

at Washington disavowed the act again and rebuked the subordinate. Congress was soothed, but not so the people of the west and south. They were fully aware, as have been all our frontiersmen and pioneers from the beginning, that the Mississippi and all the lands it waters are the organic structure of unity and successful settlement on this continent. The Pacific and Atlantic coast strips, even the great but bleak valley of the St. Lawrence, are incidents of territorial unity and political control compared with the great alluvion of the Mississippi. This was unknown, utterly unknown, and worse yet, entirely indifferent to our statesmen. Madison certainly, and possibly Jefferson, believed that western immigration would pause and end on the east bank of the Father of Waters.

Yet party government was a necessity under our system, and Jefferson's ladder, the Republican party, would be knocked into its component parts should the West and South, noisy, exacting, and turbulent, desert and go over to the expiring faction of the Federalists; nay worse, it might be forced into almost complete negation of its own existence by a forced adoption of the Federalist policy, alliance with Great Britain—monarchic and aristocratic—rather than with radical and democratic France. What could a distracted partizan do? Jefferson was adroit and inventive. He sent James Monroe to negotiate with Bonaparte for the purchase of New Orleans and both Floridas at the price of two millions, or upward to ten, for all or part, whatever he could get; he was not even to disdain the deposit or storage right, if nothing else could be had, and if he could get nothing, he was to await instructions. With such credentials he sailed on March 8, 1803. A peace-lover must sometimes speak low and small, even as cowards sometimes do. Three weeks later appeared in New Orleans Laussat, the advance agent of French occupation; Victor and his troops were to follow. It is not possible to conceive that a foreign policy should be more perplexing, confused, or uncertain than that of the philosophic theorist who is the hero of the strict-constructionist party in these United States.

Robert R. Livingston, the regular American envoy at Paris, had, under his instructions from home, worked with skill and zeal on the spoliation claims and incidentally on the question of the Mississippi and the Floridas. While the colonization schemes of Bonaparte seemed feasible, Livingston made no headway whatever, except to extort an admission that the spoliation claims were just. Neither Talleyrand nor Livingston was much concerned about the great northwest. The American was clear that the importance of any control lay in the possession of New Orleans, and on April 11, 1803, he said so to the French minister, vigorously and squarely declaring

further that a persistent refusal of our request would unite us with Great Britain to the serious discomfiture of France in her colonial aspirations. This was said with some asperity, for Livingston had been aware that the First Consul wanted all negotiation transferred to Washington under the guidance of a special envoy sent for the purpose, the wilful Bernadotte, and now worse yet, he himself was to be superseded by Monroe. He had been a diligent and even importunate negotiator; it was a ray of comfort in later days to recall that the first suggestion for the sale of all Louisiana was made to him in that momentous interview.

What had occurred Livingston could not know. It was this. On the morning of that very day there reached the Tuileries despatches giving in full detail an account of the tremendous preparations making in England for the renewal of war both by land and sea. Bonaparte's impatience knew no bounds. Hitherto he had concealed his true policy of sale behind a scheme to spend the purchase-money on internal improvements in France, and he had on his work-table map-outlines for five great canals. Now, at daybreak, he summoned Barbé-Marbois, sometime French consul-general in the United States, an official of state with a thorough knowledge of our affairs, and ordered that a negotiation for the sale, not of the Floridas and New Orleans, but of all Louisiana, should immediately be opened with Livingston. He fixed the price at fifty million francs. The envoy could of course do nothing, but he thought thirty millions enough. Next day Monroe arrived at Havre, and reaching Paris April 13, that very same day Barbé-Marbois and our two great statesmen began to treat. Upon Monroe and Livingston devolved a momentous responsibility. Monroe was by a most indefinite implication left a certain liberty, for under no circumstances whatsoever was he to end a negotiation if once it was begun. And here, instead of minimizing terms, was, so to speak, a great universe of land tender. But we had not so easily thrown off the bright and glistening garment of righteousness as had Napoleon Bonaparte, and in the minds of both Americans was the question, non-existent for the First Consul, as he himself squarely said, of whether the inhabitants of the district, men and women, human souls, could be dealt in as chattels are.

Livingston had already seen darkly as in a glass what the west might make of the United States. Bonaparte's contributions to the discussion were terse and trenchant. If he did not transfer the title right speedily, a British fleet would take possession almost in a twinkling: the transfer, he said, might in three centuries make America the rival of Europe; why not, it was a long way ahead; but, on the

other hand, there never had been an enduring confederation, and this one in America was unlikely to begin the series; finally, he wanted the cash as the United States wanted the land. Let there be no delay. And there was none. The terms of the sale and the facts of the transfer do not concern us here. In Bonaparte we had no friend; but what the ancient régime began in establishing an American independence, the First Consul completed; for, thanks to him, we fought the War of 1812 for commercial liberty, while the exploitation of Louisiana has made us what we are to-day. The instant we accepted that great territory, with all its responsibilities and possibilities, we became a world power. We were puny enough as a world power at first, but we have grown. Jefferson and his agents were primarily statesmen for the purpose of existing conditions, and in Monroe's mission desired a remedy solely and entirely for party evils. They had, however, the courage to accept the fortune forced upon them, even though in their case, as in that of Bonaparte, it entailed, we repeat, a complete reversal of all the political and party principles of the platform on which they had hitherto stood.

The change wrought by the Louisiana purchase in American life and culture was simply revolutionary. Hitherto in our weakness we had faced backward, varying between two ideas of European alliance. We virtually had British and French parties. Jefferson, who represented the latter, thought of no other alternative in his trouble than to strike hands with England. With Louisiana on our hands we turned our faces to our own front door. The Louisiana we bought had no Pacific outlet in reality, but the Lewis and Clark expedition gave it one, and that we have broadened by war and purchase until we control the western shore of the continent. Under such engrossing cares we ceased to think of either French or British ties, except as exasperating, and became not merely Americans, but, realizing Washington's aspirations, turned into real continentals, with a scorn of all entanglements whatever. In the occupation and settlement of Louisiana the slavery question became acute, and it was the struggle for the expansion of that system over Louisiana soil which precipitated the Civil War.

But if the change in national outlook was radical, that in constitutional attitude was even more so. The constitutions of our original states were the expression of political habits in a community, the Federal Constitution was in the main a transcript of those elements which were common in some degree to all the British colonies. It was an age of written constitutions, because the flux of institutions was so rapid that men needed a mooring for the substantial gains they had made. The past was so recent that statesmen were timid,

and they wanted their metes and bounds to be fixed by a monument. Nothing was more natural than to pause and fall back on the record thus made permanent, and strict construction was and long continued to be a political fetish. The Louisiana purchase was a circumstance of the first importance in party struggle. Yet neither Federalist nor Republican dared, after mature deliberation, to urge the question of constitutional amendment as essential to meet the crisis thus precipitated. The enormous price entailed what was felt to be an intolerable burden of taxation, and in the uproar of spoken and printed debate played no small part. But the vital question was whether the adjustment of new relations was constitutional.

Never did the kaleidoscope of politics display a more surprising reversal of effect. The loose-construction party lost its wits entirely, while the strict constructionists suddenly became the apostles not of verbal but of logical construction. Jefferson violated his principles in signing the treaty, but he was easily persuaded that amendment was not necessary, that on the contrary the treaty-making power covered the case completely. This was not conquest, which would have been covered by the war power, but purchase, which is covered by the treaty power surrendered, like the other, by the states to the federal government. The Federalists were represented in the House by Gaylord Griswold; in the Senate by Ross and Pickering. Their resistance was identical in both, factious to the highest degree. They contended that the executive had usurped the powers of Congress by regulating commerce with foreign powers and by incorporating foreign soil and foreign people with the United States, this last being a power which it was doubtful whether Congress possessed. Supposing, however, that New Orleans became American, how could a treaty be valid which gave preferential treatment to that single port in admitting French and Spanish ships on equal terms with those owned by Americans? The treaty, they asseverated, was therefore unconstitutional and, even worse, impolitic, because we were unfitted and did not desire to incorporate into our delicately-balanced system peoples different in speech, faith, and customs from ourselves. They were, however, only mildly opposed to expansion; they were determined and captious in the interpretation of the Constitution. The party in power were avowedly expansionist; their retort was equally dialectic and vapid. The whole discussion would have been empty except for Pickering's contention that there existed no power to incorporate foreign territory into the United States, as was stipulated by the treaty. The House had resolved, 90 to 25, to provide the money and had appointed a committee on provisional government: the Senate ratified the treaty, 26 to 5.

What made the debates and action of Congress epochal was the Federalist contention that Thomas Jefferson as provisional and interim governor was nothing more or less than an American despot in succession to a Spanish tyrant. Where was the Constitution now; where would it be when in appointing the necessary officials—executive, judicial, and legislative—he would usurp not merely Spanish despotism but the powers of both the other branches of the federal government? The Republicans quibbled, too; to appoint these three classes of officials was not to exercise their powers. But they confirmed in unanswerable logic a distinction thus far only mooted in our political history—that between states and territories. Already presidential appointees were exercising all three powers in Mississippi and Indiana. This clenched the contentions of the Republicans, and the bill for provisional government passed by an overwhelming vote on October 31. Both parties throughout the struggle had tacitly abandoned the position that Congress possessed merely delegated powers and nothing further except the ability to carry them into effect. Both therefore admitted the possible interpretation of the Constitution under stress of necessity, and the Federalists in their quibbling contentions lost hold everywhere except in New England. That section saw its influence eclipsed by the preponderance of Southern and Western power and ere long was ripe for secession.

Volumes have been written and more will be on the romance of the Louisiana purchase; Josiah Quincy threatened the dismemberment of the Union when the present state of Louisiana was admitted in 1812; but for Jefferson's wisdom in exploration it might have remained a wilderness long after settlement began; Great Britain coveted it in 1815 when Jackson saved it; Aaron Burr probably coveted an empire within it; Napoleon III. had dreams of its return to the new France he was to found in Mexico. Excluding the Floridas, which Spain would not concede as a part of it, and the Oregon country, the territory thus acquired was greater than that of Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy combined. Its agricultural and mineral resources were, humanly speaking, inexhaustible. No wonder it excited the cupidity as it stirred the imagination of mankind: no wonder if men avid to retain their power were dismayed at the preponderance it was sure to exert eventually in a federal union of states. At the present moment fourteen of our commonwealths, with a population of about 16,000,000 and a taxable wealth of seven billions occupy its soil. By the time we are fifty years older, at the present rate of settlement, these will contain about a third of the power in the Union as determined by numbers and pros-

perity. All of them, however, were never more than administrative districts, and by the retroactive influence of this fact state sovereignty has thus been made an empty phrase.

And this leads us to our final contention. If the Louisiana purchase revolutionized our national outlook, our constitutional attitude, and our sectional control, it has quite as radically changed our national texture. From that hour to this we have called to the masses of Europe for help to develop the wilderness, and they have come by millions, until now the men and women of Revolutionary stock probably number less than 15,000,000 in the entire country. These later Americans have, like the migrations of the Norsemen in central and southern Europe, proved so conservative in their Americanism that they outrun their predecessors in loyalty to its essentials. They made the Union as it now is, in a very high sense, and there is no question that in the throes of civil war it was their blood which flowed at least as freely as ours in defense of it. It is they who have kept us from developing on colonial lines and have made us a nation separate and apart. This it is which has prevented the powerful influence of Great Britain from inundating us, while simultaneously two English-speaking peoples have reacted one upon the other in their radical differences to keep aflame the zeal for exploration, beneficent occupation, and general exploitation of the globe in the interests of a high civilization. The localities of the Union have been stimulated into such activities that manufactures and agriculture have run a mighty race: commerce alone lags, and no wonder, for Louisiana gave us a land world of our own, a home market more valuable than both the Indies or the continental mass of the east.

WILLIAM M. SLOANE.

DOCUMENTS

1. *The Interment of William Lovelace, New York, 1671.*

THIS description of funeral solemnities in New York is of interest as presenting one of the earliest pictures of the social customs in the colony during the first decade of the control of the English, and is the only one of this character.¹

The pomp of the ceremony was due doubtless to the relationship with the family of the governor and also to the position of the two brothers Thomas and Dudley Lovelace in the colony. They held military offices in New York, and their names appear among the three signatures to the "Exact Account of all the Proceedings of the military officers of Fort James, from 28 July, 1673, to the surrender of the fort", which is in the Colonial Papers, Vol. XXX., number 52. Thomas Lovelace was one of the three men sent to the Dutch vessel to demand the cause of its coming into the harbor, and Dudley, together with Captain Manning, was in charge of the fort at the time of its surrender. References to both Thomas and Dudley appear in O'Callaghan's *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, II. As late as 1685 Thomas Lovelace was sheriff of Richmond county.

The document is among the Ashmolean Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, Volume 846, folio 54, number xi, and is written on both sides of a quarto sheet of seventeenth-century paper, in the hand of the period. It appears to be a memorandum of the occurrence, probably written in New York and sent or taken to England later, but by whom or under what circumstances there is no evidence. Neither is it clear how it came into the possession of Elias Ashmole, nor why it should have been bound in this volume, as it seems to have no relation to the documents on pedigrees, descents, and rolls of nobility there found. However, the papers

¹ This document will throw considerable light on the vexed question of the Lovelace genealogy. See *Lucasta. The Poems of Richard Lovelace, Esq., now first edited, and the Text carefully Revised. With some account of the Author*, by W. Carew Hazlitt, London, 1864, xii ff.; 218, note; 227, note; "Colonel Francis Lovelace and his Plantation on Staten Island", by Edward C. Delavan, Jr., in *Proceedings of the Natural Science Association of Staten Island*, Vol. VII., No. 15, pp. 47-79, March 10, 1900; "Lord Lovelace and the Second Canadian Campaign, 1708-1710", by General James Grant Wilson, in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1891*, 269-272.—ED.

in this volume, as in many others of the Ashmolean collection, are of a miscellaneous character, treating of medicine, ecclesiastical rents, affairs of the exchequer, and other subjects. This fact doubtless explains why such a unique document should have been overlooked heretofore.

SUSAN M. KINGSBURY.

The funeral Solemnities at the Intern^t of M^r W^m Lovelace at New Yorke in America 1671.

The manner of Exposing the Corps in the Roome before the Buriall

1—The Roome was very spacious and hung all about wth Mourning and Escotcheons thereupon of his Peternall Coate to the number of 30.

2—Round the sayd Roome were placed Turkey worke chayres richly wrought.

3. In the Middest of the Roome stood the Hearse with Sheete and Pall encompassed with 8. of his Paternall Escotcheons.

4. At the head a Pall of deaths heads and bones richly embroidered hung over as a Canopy.

5. Over the middle of the Herse a rich Garland hung adorn'd with black and white Satten ribbands and an houre Glasse impending.

6. At the ffeete a sheild 4 foote square cotes of Armes quartered and gloriously gilt which together wth the Garland remaines as a monument in the Church to this day.

7. Round the hearse stood A black stand with Silver Candlestick wax Tap's and p'fumes burning night and day to the view of all people.

8. A Rich Cupbord of Plate worth 200^{li}

9. 4: Attendants night and day.

10. The Partall or entry to the Roome was curiously adorned wth pictures Statues and other fancies in carved worke.

The funerall Procession.

1. The Capt: of the dead.

2. The Minister.

3. An Esq^r in mourning carrying the Sheild.

4. The 2: Preaching Ministers.

5. Two Maidens clothed in white silke carrying the Garland wth Cyprus Scarves and Gloves tyed with a whole peice with black and white Satten Ribband.

6. The Corps carried by 6. Gentlemen Batchelers all in Mourning, with Skarves and Gloves.

7. The Pall held up by 6. virgins all in white Silke wth Cyprus Skarves and Gloves.

8. Tho: Lovelace Esq: father to the deceased and his Lady in close Mourning.

9. 4. Halbertes with velvet Coates and Badges thereon embroidered with his Crest of 40^{li} a Coate.

10. Coll: ffancis Lovelace p'sent Governo^r of New Yorke and uncle to the deceased in close Mourning single.

11. Capt: Dudley Lovelace uncle also to the deceased in like mourning single.
12. The Councell all in Mourning.
13. The Mace with Maior and Aldermen in their black Gownes
14. The Principall Burgers of the Citty 2: and 2.
15. All the English and Dutch Women 2: and 2.
16. The cheife English and Dutch Men. 2 and 2.
17. All Masters of Shippes and Vessells.
18. All the other English and Dutch men. 2. and 2. to the number of 500. the greatest p't of them in black.

Wines sweet meats and Bisketts and such Services till 10. at night.

At the entrance of the ffort stood his Royall hignes's Company of Guards with Colours furl'd Drums beating a ffunerall March and afterwards severall great Gunns fired thence.

At the Interm^t of the Corps 30. peices of Ordnance more fired.

2. *A Letter of Benjamin Franklin, 1775.*

THE following letter of Franklin was discovered by me in a volume of the Continental Congress Papers containing "Letters of John Hancock and Miscellaneous Papers". Franklin had acknowledged the receipt of the Petition to the King in a letter to Thomson, dated February 5, 1775, a letter which was unsigned, and is now among the so-called Thomson Papers in the New York Historical Society. This second letter on the Petition, also unsigned, has escaped notice, although it is wholly in Franklin's well-known writing. Even the clerk in the Secretary's office who at a later day indorsed or docketed the paper was strangely ignorant of its origin, for he wrote: "Letter, March 19, 1775. Anonymous from London to C: Thomson, Esq." Indeed the year of the indorsement looks more like 1795 than 1775. The original is in the Papers of the Continental Congress, Volume 58, folio 343, now in the Library of Congress.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN TO CHARLES THOMSON.

LONDON, March 13, 1775

Dear Sir,

I have some Thoughts of going with Osborne¹; but as I may be disappointed in that, I write a few Lines, to acquaint you, that the Petition of the Congress has lain upon the Table of both Houses ever since it was sent down to them among the Papers that accompany'd it from above, and has had no particular Notice taken of it; our Petition to be heard in support of it, having been, as I wrote you before, rejected with Scorn in the Commons; which must satisfy the future Congress that nothing is to be expected here from that Mode of Application.

¹ Captain Osborne, of the *Pennsylvania Packet*, with whom Franklin went to Philadelphia later in this month.

Nearly all the manufacturing and trading Towns that are concern'd with America have now petition'd Parliament to do something for healing the Differences that threaten Ruin to their Commerce. Administration, which has appear'd to stagger several times within these two Months, must have given way before this time ; but have been supported chiefly by Accounts from America that all was fluctuating there, and that a little longer Perseverance would triumph over the Factions, as they are called, and bring the whole Continent to full and *unconditional* Submission. A Bill has therefore pass'd the Commons, to deprive New England of its Fishery, as well as its Trade, and a new Bill is ordered in, to extend the Restraints on Trade to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. Of New York they have great Hopes, and some of North Carolina, which Colonies are therefore omitted. All the Colonies, but those of New England, it is given out, may still make Peace for themselves, by acknowledging the Supreme unlimited Power of Parliament : But those are absolutely to be *conquered* : After which possibly they may obtain a Quebec Constitution. — More Troops are accordingly preparing to go over. — And yet with all this *Face of Resolution*, it is certain that the Ministers are far from being cordially united in these Measures ; that some of them tremble for their Places, and all for the Event as it relates to the Publick. While wise Observers are confident, that if America can hold strictly to its Non Consumption Agreement another Year, it is impossible they can stand the universal Clamour which begins to thicken round their Heads, and that they must therefore be overthrown, and routed ; and the Friends of America come into Administration. It is indeed evident that the present Set are apprehensive of this, since, to secure themselves against the Danger of Impeachment, they take care in every Step to get Parliament to *lead* and *advise* the Measures to be taken : Contrary to the ancient Practice of the Executive Power in taking its Measures as Occasion requir'd, and depending on their Rectitude for the future Approbation of Parliament.

I flatter myself that neither New York nor any other Colony will be cajol'd into a Separation from the common Interest. Our only Safety is in the firmest Union, and keeping strict Faith with each other. If any Colony suffers itself to be detach'd from the common Cause by the artful Management of Ministers, that Colony will first incur the Detestation of the rest ; and when that is become the Case, and none can be concern'd at any ill Usage it may receive, it will on some Pretence or other be treated just as roughly as the others whom it had so basely abandon'd.

With great Esteem, I am, Sir, Your Most
obedient humble Servant

[B. FRANKLIN.]

Charles Thompson Esq^r

3. *William Jackson on Conditions in France, 1794.*

WILLIAM JACKSON, the writer of this letter, was born in England in 1759, but was brought to Charleston, South Carolina, when a

child. He served in the Revolutionary army until 1781, when he accompanied John Laurens as secretary on his special mission to France. On his return he was on General Washington's staff for a short time, and was then appointed assistant secretary of war, 1782-1783, under General Lincoln. At the close of the war he visited Europe again, and shortly after his return was made secretary to the Federal Convention of 1787. He served as President Washington's private secretary during his first administration and then spent two years in Europe, the accompanying letter being written during this period. On his return he was appointed surveyor of the port of Philadelphia, an office which he held until his removal by Jefferson in 1806. He died in Philadelphia in 1828.

The original letter, fifteen pages in length, is now in the State Department, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, England, Vol. 3. It was sent to Edmund Randolph from London by Thomas Pinckney, then our minister to England, who says in his despatch of May 5, 1794:

Major Jackson wrote me a letter from Paris containing information relating to the situation of affairs in France. You have undoubtedly the most accurate intelligence on that subject, but as it is possible this letter may contain some details you have not before seen I send it for your perusal.

WILLIAM JACKSON TO THOMAS PINCKNEY.

PARIS, April — 1794.

My dear Sir,

Having received no acknowledgement of four letters which I have written to you since my arrival in France, I conclude they have not reached you — Discouraging as this supposition is, I have determined once more to attempt a transmission of such intelligence as I suppose may be personally interesting to yourself, and, through you, useful to our Country.

France at this moment exhibits such scenes as the pencil of Salvator-Rosa would have been well employed to delineate — abounding in light and shade, which is at once splendid and awful. To use the language of a more modern artist, and one fonder of *gilding* than Salvator, France is in truth "an armed Nation" — her firmness and exertions seem well proportioned to the resistance, which her situation requires, and far exceed the expectation, which our limited acquaintance with the power and resources of such a Nation, resolved to be free, could have excited.

No longer resembling Venus attended by the Graces, she now represents Minerva followed by the Fates.

You must pardon this imagery, it is really necessary to convey an idea of facts, or to describe the change, which has here taken place — indeed it is only by what, in common parlance, would be considered as extravagant hyperbole, that one can express the situation of this most extraordinary People.

Wherever you move, or to whatever quarter your attention is turned, nothing meets the view but warlike preparation — Every consideration is sacrificed to public exigence, every contribution of property or service, which the public necessity requires, appears to be cheerfully made, and in the few instances, where reluctance may exist, terror supplies the absence of patriotism, and operates its full effect—¹

Age and infancy are employed in extracting from the earth (and, by a late refinement in chemistry, from vegetables) the thunders which youth and manhood are to direct,² while the cares of domestic life are entirely devolved on the female part of the society.

Fifteen armies, forming a force, which I do not think exaggerated, of 1200,000 men,³ are now in the actual service of the Republic — and it has been surmised that a part of the second requisition would be made before the opening of the campaign.

Should this additional effort be deemed necessary, the coalesced nations of Europe must unquestionably yield to the momentum of an individual power, exceeding in numbers and array all that the world has hitherto exhibited.

Perplexed by the variety of interesting objects, which attract my attention, I am really at a loss where to begin in giving you the details of these formidable preparations.

The first requisition has been carried into complete effect, that is to say all the unmarried men of this extensive nation from the age of 18 to 25, whatever their situation or fortune (for neither money nor substitutes would exempt them from service) have joined the several armies of the Republic which they have augmented with a force of 600,000.— These levies have been incorporated with the ancient corps, and have been under a strict discipline for several months.⁴ The Cavalry has been so considerably increased as to require that the swords exceeding thirty

¹ *Le Moniteur Universel* for February 2 and 3, 1794, contains a report by Barère in which an account of this warlike activity is given with much spirit. Cf. also Taine, *Revolution*, III. 54-56, and von Sybel, *French Revolution* (Perry's translation, London, 1869), III. 312.

² Barère's report, cited above, contains a full account of this manufacture of gunpowder. Evidently it was an important subject, for the *Moniteur* contains many reports of the manufacture of saltpeter in various parts of France. Cf. also *Ure's Dictionary of Arts, etc.* (edited by Hunt), under potash, nitrate of, where is found the statement that 2,000 tons of saltpeter were annually produced in France from artificial niter beds.

³ In the report of Barère, cited above, is the exclamation, "Une trêve avec douze cents mille républicains sous les armes!" In Jomini's *Histoire des Guerres de la Révolution* (Brussels, 1840), I. 9, is a table purporting to give the strength of the French armies on April 15, 1794. In the text the author states that there were nearly 1,200,000 soldiers but only about "700,000 combattants étaient en situation de prendre partout l'offensive". Von Sybel, however, does not believe that the French forces were nearly so large as represented; he places the total at the end of 1793 at 600,000 and the next spring at 871,000. *French Revolution*, III. 209 and note; 317 and note.

⁴ This was the decree of August 23, 1793. Von Sybel does not believe that this new levy was so readily incorporated in the old corps. By the decree of November 22, 1793, some of the difficulties attendant upon the levy were provided for. Von Sybel, III. 306-309; 311-313. Cf. Taine, III. 56.

inches in blade should be taken from the Infantry for their use. The augmentation is upwards of 50,000, and the remounted exceeds 30,000 — The whole force in Cavalry being at least 100,000 — So that in this arm, which, during the last campaign, was the weakest part of their composition, I am persuaded the french will be superior to the allies.¹ The artillery, so formidable in the last campaign, has received an addition of two thousand pieces for field service, and, judging from its former effect, must I think be absolutely irresistible.

The fuel which is to nourish this immense volcano, is, as I have already intimated to you, prepared by those hands, which are otherwise unable to serve their country — and, under the direction of persons, skilled in the process, saltpetre is produced in astonishing quantity — I have daily opportunity of observing its product in the several sections of Paris, and the operation is the same throughout the Republic.²

The public founderies and manufactories of small arms aided by the mechanics, who work in metals, and who for this purpose are all in requisition, are constantly employed, and furnish immensely.³

And yet amidst all this din and preparation of arms the Country is more carefully and extensively cultivated than in any former period — You will ask by whom? By old men, by women, and the youth of both sexes under the age of 18 — This I can assure you, from personal observation, wherever I have travelled not a single spot is neglected — the very avenues and approaches to the Chateaux are ploughed — even the walks of the Tuilleries are sown and planted — and no country presents a more promising appearance, in agriculture, than France does at this moment.

It has become a public care with the several Municipalities to plant those grounds, which were formerly appropriate to pleasurable purposes, with useful vegetables and to this end regular institutions are established —

The value of the potatoe is known and sufficiently appreciated to remove every apprehension of want — Indeed so promising is the grain now in the ground that I am persuaded, from my information of the present state of their granaries, the quantity on hand and the ensuing crop will furnish an advance of provision for at least two years.

You may be assured the idea of starving France is as unfounded as it is inhuman — The variety of soil and climate in this extensive country reduce the chance of a general failure in their crops to a very remote possibility, and the invigorating energies of property and freedom have more than balanced the deductions from their agriculture occasioned by the call of their Peasantry to the frontiers — Indeed a very considerable proportion of their farming was always done by the Women of France, who still continue to cultivate the ground.

Take a single illustration of my supposition that their granaries are

¹ See von Sybel, III. 309. In *Le Moniteur Universel* for January 20, 1794, is found the decree providing for the transfer of the long sabers.

² See page 527.

³ See Barère's report, cited above. Cf. also Taine, III. 56.

well stocked — the price of bread in Paris at this moment is not half as much as in London — True it is browner, but it is equally nutritious.

Extensive manufactures of useful fabrics continue to flourish, and even the most refined articles of luxury are not neglected — Of the former I have attentively observed the cloth manufacture at Abbeville, which is in full vigour — and of the latter I have visited the Gobelins, where the most exquisite productions of the needle and the shuttle still continue to charm and astonish. This last is continued as a public establishment —

Even the palaces and pleasure grounds of the ci-devant royalty are respected as national property, and as such are carefully preserved. The greater part of the furniture has been removed from Versailles — some of the paintings remain — Those by the best Masters have been sent to the gallery of the Louvre, which is now the National museum, and exceeds in exhibition any other collection in Europe. It is under the direction of a Committee appointed to protect the fine arts, and is maintained in the very best style.

The late Queen's favorite residence of St Cloud remains as when she occupied it — The paintings will be sent to the museum, and the furniture will be sold.

In remarking on the agriculture and manufactures I have digressed from the subject of the public force to which I return.

The operations of the northern army appear to engage the greatest degree of attention, and, from its composition as well as its situation, this part of their force seems destined to the most arduous and important service.

Including the detachments on the side of Dunkirk and the garrisons, which, without risk to their posts, may be called into field service with the main body, I do not suppose this army amounts to less than 254,000 men — composed nearly in the following manner.

Brigaded Infantry	170,000
Light Corps	20,000
Cavalry	44,000
Brigaded Artillery	15,000
Artillery attached to Corps	5,000
	254,000 ¹

In addition to this immense force, no less formidable by the decided superiority of their artillery, the improved state of their discipline, arms, and oeconomical arrangements of supplies, than by their numbers, the army of the Moselle, which may be estimated at 70,000, may, by a rapid movement to its left, be brought into full co-operation, and at a very short notice, with the army of the North — for experience has demonstrated that they are capable of forming these sudden junctions by transporting their troops in carriages.

¹ Jomini places the strength of this army at the end of March, 1794, at "plus de 160,000 hommes disponibles". *Guerres de la Révolution*, II. 10. Von Sybel estimates it at 148,000, exclusive of the 74,000 men in the fortresses that protected the position of the army. *French Revolution*, III, 317.

That they are disposed to effect whatever a profuse application of money can accomplish, must be admitted—and that the means are in their power cannot be denied.

Their treasury is at this time by far the richest in Europe—perhaps more abundant than all the rest of Europe—and immoderate as their explanation appears, the sources of their supplies seem but to encrease with the streams that flow from them—The taxes that are now collected, with the donations, church property, and money received for Emigrants estates, form altogether a most inordinate mass.¹

On this subject it is also fair to remark that the Persons, who direct their fiscal arrangements, have been long enough in office to give to them all the advantages that result from method and established order—Of this a very strong proof was given some days ago by Cambon in his report on the state of their finances—He therein asserts (which unfoundedly he dared not to do) that a diminution had been effected in their expenditure of 170 millions per month—leaving the actual disbursement about 54 millions sterling [per] annum.²

Enormous as this sum may appear it is not immoderate compared with their resources—for, however extraordinary, it is true that, including the estates of the crown, the clergy, and the Emigrants one third part of the whole property of France is in confiscation—Such had been the tendency of the ancient regime to absorb and concentrate the national wealth in the hands of a few.

This fact is well understood by the men of property who have remained in France, and the reflections, which arise from it, have fully decided them to go with the revolution and to support it at all hazards. They are now aware of the worst that can happen to them under the republic, and they know full well that the confiscated property is more than competent to the expences that have been, or may be incurred to maintain the war—Whereas a counter-revolution would not only place the expences of the war to the charge, but prostrate the remainder of their property to the indemnity of those who have emigrated.

These influential considerations of property by which the more wealthy part of the people, now in France, are actuated, aided by the enthusiasm of some, the fears of others, and the resentments of all against their external enemies, have not only subdued the spirit of revolt, and condensed the public opinion in favor of the revolution, but appear to me to have decided the nation literally to adhere to their declaration to “live free or die.”

This reasoning, on a first view, may seem to be somewhat dogmatic—but compared with facts, and analysed by the test of experience, it will I think be found as true, as it may seem positive.

¹ Cf. von Sybel, III. 226-234.

² Cambon made an announcement in the Convention as follows: “Eh bien! le résultat des dépenses contre lequel nous nous élevions avec raison avant que le gouvernement eût un point central s'élevait de 390 à 400 millions par mois; il ne donne plus que 170 à 180 millions.” *Le Moniteur Universel*, March 24, 1794, page 742. Cf. von Sybel's comments, *French Revolution*, III. 310-311.

I would now state the respective strength and composition of the other armies of the Republic — but as their operations are not likely to be equally interesting or decisive with that of the North, I have been at less pains to obtain particular information respecting them: That which is intended to act against Spain, will, I think, be the next efficient in force, and impressive in its operations.

The direction of their military measures is said to be confided to a Committee of Officers of high professional talents, and distinguished service — Two of them I understand will go to the army of the North — the others will remain in Paris.

Besides this Board of Officers there are Commissioners from the Convention with each of the armies, who superintend the oeconomy of their staff arrangements, and watch over their supplies.¹

A controuling authority that may be termed absolute is vested in the Comité de Salut-Public, which is composed of the following Members, classed according to the influence which I think they respectively possess, Robespierre, Billaud de Varennes, Couthon, S^t Just, Barerre,² Jean Bon S^t André, Collot d'Herbois, Cambon, Carnot, Lindet, and Prieur.

Robespierre is certainly the apex of this pyramid — Barerre, in point of talents, may be regarded as its ablest support, — Lindet, whose application is distinguished where all are unremitting, is the Member, to whom the department of subsistence is devolved — S^t Just is very eloquent and impressive with the Convention — Jean Bon S^t André has been selected, for his energy, to regenerate their marine, and is now at Brest —

It is said that Billaud de Varennes and Carnot are to go to the army of the North — Collot d'Herbois and Couthon are very influential with the popular Societies — Prieur is less distinguished than either of his Colleagues.

The removal of Danton, La Croix,² and the other Deputies, who were executed with them, and the extinction of Hebert's² party, will give a stability to the power of this all influential Body, which nothing will be able to shake, and will enable them to call forth the remaining resources of this inexhaustible people, and to direct the application of them, if possible, more efficiently than they have yet done.

Since the recovery of Toulon the Marine has obtained great attention, and will, it is said, within a short time, be very respectable

Regulations for the government of the Navy, calculated to invigorate the discipline, have been lately enacted by the Convention, and are now in force — Every sea faring person, including the fishermen, are in requisition for public service.³

Viewed in the light I have here placed it, the picture of France is pleasing and splendid — but there are shades, which abstract from its beauty, and which a regard to truth makes necessary to confess, and to

¹ See decree of April 30, 1793, printed in Jomini's *Guerres de la Révolution*, I. 363 ff.

² Sic.

³ See reports of Saint-André and decrees reorganizing the navy in *Le Moniteur Universel* for February 5, 6, and 8, 1794.

expose — They proceed less from native defect than from accident, and may therefore be softened, perhaps be entirely removed.

In a course of conquest it is to be feared that the lust of dominion may lead this People, already the happiest Nation on the globe, in geographical position, to grasp at possessions, which, far from increasing, would eventually abridge both their happiness and their power.

The retention of Savoy I regard as irrevocable — and, unless negotiations for peace are soon entered upon, I should consider the annexation of Austrian Flanders to the french Republic as neither improbable nor remote.

This conquest, should it be made, (and that a Nation of 28 millions of people, situated as France is, being compelled to become a nation of Soldiers, should, within a very short period, achieve whatever conquest they attempt, is but too probable)

This conquest I say may be more susceptible of restitution, in exchange for her Islands — but even that I think would be doubtful, as, with the extension of her territory, her other means of obtaining their restoration must be dangerously increased.

This is a case for the consideration of those, whom I have neither the power nor the wish to influence, but I am satisfied that more political reflection should attach to it, than they, to whom it is most interesting, seem disposed to give.

As inauspicious to the happiness of France and the peace of Europe, I can only regret the near possibility of such an event.

The difficulty of organising their government, after peace, would form a darker shade than it does, if we did not reflect that the Constitution is already prepared — that the nomination to office, and the knowledge which qualifies them to select characters, would be almost exclusively in the possession of the Comité de Salut Public — and that a long continuance in office has already designated the individuals for the stations, which they ought respectively to fill: This is, nevertheless, a Source of serious apprehension, as it regards the internal peace of France, and will be deserving of all the attention, which philosophy and philanthropy can bestow upon it.

To the lenient touch of time we must refer the obliteration of those remembrances, which may nourish individual enmities for some years to come — They will not extend beyond the present generation, perhaps they will be extinguished with the war that occasioned them. It is however to be confessed, and lamented that they cloud the prospect.

I am, my dear Sir, most respectfully, Your faithful and affectionate Servant

W JACKSON

To Thomas Pinckney Esquire Minister Plenipotentiary
of the United States of America at London.

[*Indorsement* :] Major Jackson's letter April 1794 to M^r T. Pinckney

4. *A Letter of General James Wilkinson, 1806.*

IN his work, *The Aaron Burr Conspiracy*, Dr. W. F. McCaleb quotes a letter from José de Iturrigaray, the viceroy of Mexico, to Cevallos, the Spanish minister of state, March 12, 1807, in which a letter from Wilkinson is mentioned as having been delivered to him by the general's aide-de-camp, Walter Burling. Mr. McCaleb does not seem to have found a copy of the original Wilkinson letter in the Mexican archives, and had therefore to rely upon the abstract of it given in the viceroy's communication, which he terms "the key which unlocks the cipher of Wilkinson's conduct in the month of November, 1806". In using this document Mr. McCaleb seems to have fallen into three slight errors that may need a word of correction. One of these is due to a mistranslation, one probably to a typographical error, and one to the fact that the author apparently did not have the full text of the letter. On page 169 the viceroy, writing of Wilkinson, is made to say: "He finally comes to what I had anticipated, the question of payment for his services. He asks for \$85,000 in one sum, and \$26,000 in another." The precise words of the viceroy are: "... finalmente viene á recaer en que disponga yo el pago de ochenta y cinco mil pesos por una parte, y treinta y seis mil por otra." A better translation of this sentence would be: "Ultimately he falls back upon my providing for the payment of \$85,000 for one part and \$36,000 for the other."

As to the first error, it will be noticed that, if the viceroy suspected from the outset the motives of Wilkinson, he does not say so. The word ultimately (*finalmente*), moreover, is used in conjunction with an earlier plea of that officer to the effect that he had risked his life, fame, and fortune to protect Mexico from the designs of Burr. And \$36,000, not \$26,000, is the second sum mentioned.

But the Spanish phrases "por una parte . . . por otra" can hardly be rendered "in one sum . . . in another". Nor is the translation above suggested comprehensible until the letter of Wilkinson itself is carefully read. Therein it appears that the phrases refer to the twofold service Wilkinson was to perform in behalf of the Spanish possessions, and for which he asked payment. The whole letter is of so much importance that it is worth while to print it in full. The English original was destroyed in compliance with Wilkinson's request in the letter itself. The Spanish translation of it is in the Archivo Historico-Nacional, Madrid, Papeles de Estado, Legajo 5564 B.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

JAMES WILKINSON TO JOSÉ DE ITURRIGARAY.

NATCHEZ, 17 de Noviembre de 1806.

Exmo. Sr.

No ha mucho que V. E. pueda verme sobre las fronteras de la provincia de Texas sosteniendo las pretenciones y executando las ordenes del presidente de los Estados Unidos, y ahora estoy sin ordenes ó autoridad de mi gobierno, esforzando todo mi poder para sostener la buena fé de estos estados, oponiéndome á una tormenta que se forma de la parte del Este que amenaza el asiento sobre que V. E. está sentado, y si no se reprime á tiempo, trastornará los cimientos del imperio sobre el qual preside.

Ha sido con el objeto de resistir esta rebolucionaria tempestad que he transferido tan velocemente mis tropas desde el Rio de las Sabinas á la Nueva Orleans sin saber las disposiciones de los Estados Unidos, y he tomado y seguiré con iguales medidas sobre mi propia autoridad, como por mis medias privadas, que me pongan de estado de impedir el estruendo, si es posible, que amenaza la destrucción del reyno mexicano.

Esta infernal combinación se compone de Casadores del Kentucky y establecimientos del Ohio capitaneados por sujetos de capacidad y esperiencia y gefes distinguidos de la Revolución americana á quienes se les ha prometido una fuerza naval Británica disfrasada para cooperar con ellos.

La Nueva Orleans debe ser la primera víctima de su rapacidad. Despues deberá hecharse sobre la Vera Cruz, y la conquista de la ciudad donde V. E. reside debe seguirse de donde el Evangelio de la revolución y revelión deberá propagarse hasta sus más remotas provincias y escenas de violencia como de pillage debe[n] seguirse. Para contrarrestar estas calamidades, de las quales la vista y el ánimo se apartan con horror, como un Leonidas me arrojaré en el paso, defendiéndolo ó pereciendo en la empresa: pero como la pequeñez de mis fuerzas contra una quadrilla de desesperados puede ocasionar el éxito del conflicto ni cierto, aconsejaria á V. E. que sin perder un momento de tiempo pusiera á la Vera Cruz en estado de rechazar un cuerpo de 129 hombres, y que asimismo tubiera el ojo alerta á los puntos principales de la costa, porque si los bandidos son rechazados de la Vera Cruz, pueden intentar un desembarco en otra parte: mediante á hallarse acompañados de ciertos emisarios desesperados de esas provincias que conocen bien las costas y animarán á los revolucionarios de perseverar en el seguro de una revolución general de los súbditos de V. E. á su favor.

Para los nombres y caracteres de los caudillos de esta audaz empresa y los pormenores de este infernal comploté ruego á V. E. confie en el dador W. Burling Esqr. (Escudero) el único sugeto que existe á quien yo pudiera fiar esta misión, y á quien he podido persuadir abandonara el descanso de su casa en una estación tan cruda para luchar con las fatigas y peligros de una larga caminata entre desiertos y bosques por mi personal influjo sobre él, y la solemne seguridad que le he dado que V. E. le remuneraría con liberalidad por los trabajos y riesgos á que se hallara expuesto.

Por lo que á mi toca arriesgo mi vida, mi fama y bienes por las medias que he adoptado: mi vida por la mutación que he hecho en las disposiciones militares sin el conocimiento de mi gobierno; mi fama por ofrecer esta comunicación á una potencia extranjera sin ordenes, y mi fortuna ó bienes, agotando mi propio bolsillo y los de mis amigos para eludir, frustrar, y si fuese posible, destruir los planes nefarios de los revolucionarios.

El elevado puesto de V. E. encierra un caracter sublime de honor, y bajo de este supuesto le he franqueado mi confianza para salvar ese pais, en la plena persuasión que esta carta despues de traducida, testimoniada, y archivada en cifra se hará pedazos en la presencia del dador y que en la cuenta que V. E. diese á su corte de este asunto se omita que mi nombre sea conocido á los gobiernos Británnicos, Franceses, y Americanos.

Para desbaratar los planes y destruir el concierto y la armonia de los bandidos que en la actualidad se están formando en el Ohio, he destinado por medio de agentes idoneos la cantidad de ochenta y cinco mil pesos, y para el despacho ejecutivo de copias y contrarevolucionarios treinta y seis mil pesos que espero sean reintegrados al dador, por cuya seguridad á su regreso ruego á V. E. mande se le franquee una escolta correspondiente hasta las inmediaciones de Natchitoches; y confiase firmemente en la equidad de V. E. en el caso que la providencia me conserve la vida y me ponga en estado de derrotar á los bandidos destinados contra Mexico, tendria la vondad de considerar justo y equitativo el reintegro de qualesquiera otras ganas que me vea precisado á hacer en sostener la causa comun de buen gobierno, orden y humanidad.

Eñmo. Sör. con profundo respeto tengo el honor de ser el más obediente y humilde, aunque inconocido, servidor de V. E —

(firmado) DIEGO WILKINSON.

Al Eñmo. Señor Virrey del Reyno de México y territorio anexo.

[Translation.]

NATCHEZ, November 17, 1806.

Most Excellent Sir:

Not long ago your Excellency might have seen me on the frontiers of the province of Texas upholding the claims and carrying into execution the orders of the president of the United States. Now without orders or authority from my government I am trying with all my might to keep good faith on the part of these states, while I face a storm gathering in the east which threatens the seat of government in which your Excellency is placed, and which, if not dispelled in time, will overthrow the foundations of the empire under your rule.

Although ignorant of what the United States might wish me to do, it was to withstand this revolutionary tempest that I recalled my troop so suddenly from the Sabine river to New Orleans. On my own responsibility and by my own private means I have taken and shall continue to take such measures as will enable me to check the commotion that threatens destruction to the realm of Mexico.

This infernal combination is composed of backwoodsmen from Kentucky and the settlements along the Ohio. It is led by able and experienced men and officers distinguished in the American Revolution, who have been secretly promised the cöoperation of a British naval force.¹

New Orleans is to be the first victim of their rapacity. Afterward they are to attack Vera Cruz, and then will follow the conquest of the city in which your Excellency resides, from which point the gospel of revolution and rebellion is to be spread to the remotest provinces, and scenes of violence and pillage must ensue. In order to ward off these calamities, from which sight and mind recoil in horror, I will hurl myself like a Leonidas into the breach, defending it or perishing in the attempt. But, since the feebleness of my force when pitted against a band of desperados might make the issue of the conflict uncertain, I would advise your Excellency, without losing a moment's time, to place Vera Cruz in a condition to beat back a force of 129 men,² and also to keep a watchful eye on the chief ports along the coast; because, if the bandits should be repulsed from Vera Cruz, they might plan to disembark elsewhere. Accompanied, as they will be, by certain desperate emissaries from the Mexican provinces, who know the coasts well, they will encourage the revolutionists to persevere in the hope of a general uprising among your Excellency's subjects in their favor.

For the names and characters of the leaders of this bold undertaking, as well as for the details of this infernal plot, I beg your Excellency to trust the bearer, W. Burling, Esq., the only person living to whom I could confide this mission. Thanks to my personal influence, and the solemn assurance I have given him that your Excellency would reward him liberally for the labors and hazards to which he will be exposed, I have been able to persuade him to leave the quiet of his home in this inclement season of the year and struggle with the fatigue and perils of a long journey through desert and wilderness.

So far as I am concerned, I am risking my life, my good name, and my property by the means I have adopted: my life by the change I have made in the military arrangements without the knowledge of my government; my good name by offering without orders this communi-

¹ The Spanish government, of course, was already well informed on this point through the communications of Yrujo, the minister at Washington, based upon the supposed revelations of Burr's henchman, Jonathan Dayton. In his letter to Cevallos, December 5, 1805 (Archivo Historico-Nacional, Estado, Legajo 5541), he says, "The expedition on the part of England is to be composed of three ships of the line, and seven or eight smaller armed vessels which will bring arms, ammunition, and artillery." Yrujo adds, however, "He [Dayton] wanted to bamboozle me with the mysterious information . . . and, despairing of any advantage from his rôle as a conspirator, since England has not entered into his schemes, he has essayed to play the part of the faithful thief by revealing to me a secret that for many reasons it was rather to his interest not to divulge."

² Assuming that the text of the letter is correct, this number appears to have been Wilkinson's estimate of the number of men then (November, 1806) actually at the disposal of Burr. Ralston told Dr. Carmichael, January 11, 1807 (Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, II. Appendix LXXXV), that "the number of men at present with Colonel Burr, did not exceed one hundred and fifty", *i. e.*, at the time Burr reached New Madrid.

cation to a foreign power; and my fortune or possessions by draining my private purse and those of my friends in order to elude, frustrate, and, if possible, destroy the nefarious schemes of the revolutionists.

The exalted station of your Excellency bears with it a sublimely honorable character, and under this supposition I have given you my confidence as a means to save your country, in the full persuasion that, after this letter has been translated, attested, and placed in cipher in the archives, it will be destroyed in the presence of the bearer, and that in the report which your Excellency may make to your court on this matter, you will see that my name is not divulged to the British, French, and American governments.

Through the instrumentality of suitable agents I have arranged to expend the sum of 85,000 pesos in shattering the plans and destroying the union and harmony among the bandits now being enrolled along the Ohio, and 36,000 in the discretionary despatch of supplies and counter-revolutionists, which sums¹ I trust will be reimbursed to the bearer, for whose safe return I ask your Excellency to furnish a suitable escort as far as the immediate neighborhood of Natchitoches. I trust, also, that I may confide fully in your Excellency's sense of justice, so that in case Providence spares my life and enables me to rout the bandits destined against Mexico, you will regard as fair and equitable the reimbursement of whatever other outlays I may have to make in upholding the common cause of good government, order, and humanity.

I have the honor to be, most excellent sir, with profound respect,
your Excellency's most obedient and humble, although unknown servant,
(Signed) JAMES WILKINSON.

To his Excellency, the Viceroy of the kingdom of Mexico and territory annexed.

5. *A Letter of Admiral Farragut, 1853.*

AMONG the Draper Manuscripts in the library of the Wisconsin Historical Society there is a letter (press-mark, 6 xx 60) by David

¹ Whether or not these statements of Wilkinson are absolutely false, and the whole affair is accordingly a brazen swindle, must remain undetermined for the present. In the absence of better evidence, however, the affirmative view receives considerable support, first, from the well-known duplicity of Wilkinson in connection with the Burr conspiracy, and secondly, from the assertions in his *Memoirs*, II. 326-327, that he did not appreciate how serious the projects of Burr had become, and hence that he had not made elaborate preparations to forestall them, until November 6 (eleven days only before the above letter to the viceroy was written), when a letter of warning reached him from James L. Donaldson, of Natchez. He says: "notwithstanding the communications of Swartwout, my mind was not entirely satisfied, and I could not give full credit to his information. But this letter of Mr. Donaldson removed my doubts; and I lost not a moment, after the receipt of it, to put in operation all the means I commanded, for repelling the formidable force, which I now expected would soon be before New Orleans; to which capital my eyes were immediately directed." Again: "I had not formed a decided opinion, of the nature and objects of Burr's enterprise, before the receipt of Mr. Donaldson's letter. . . . I then first perceived, it was wholly unauthorised by the government: — highly criminal in the design, — most alarming in its extent. . . . I had no longer any difficulty, as to the course of conduct, my duty, and the interests of the nation, required me to pursue."

Glasgow Farragut, which merits publication. It was written by Farragut, then a commander, in reply to queries which had been put to him by Dr. Lyman C. Draper, who was seeking far and wide for information relative to pioneer life in Kentucky and Tennessee. In this document Farragut gives some interesting information concerning his father and his own early years that has not appeared in any of the biographies.

In reading the letter it will be helpful, by way of introduction, to remember that the admiral's father, George Farragut, was a Spaniard, coming of a long line of soldiers, sailors, and magistrates, and was born on the island of Minorca in 1755. In a spirit of adventure he came to America in 1776, and served the American cause in the Revolutionary War, both in the navy and as a cavalry major in Tennessee. He settled in Tennessee as a farmer, and married Elizabeth Shine, a Scotch woman of North Carolina. To them was born July 5, 1801, David Glasgow. Later the Farraguts moved to Louisiana, where Major Farragut became attached to the New Orleans naval station. Mrs. Farragut died of yellow fever in 1808.

Young David was but nine years old when appointed a midshipman in the navy, under the tutelage of Commodore Porter; and his memory of still earlier childhood days in Tennessee, as shown in this letter, gives additional evidence of precocity.

R. G. THWAITES.

DAVID G. FARRAGUT TO DR. LYMAN C. DRAPER.

NORFOLK VA

Sept 20th 1853

Dear Sir

Your note has been received and it would give me great pleasure to comply with your request if it was in my power, but I really know so little of my Father's history that it would scarcely aid you in your object, I only remember my Father in Tennessee as a Farmer and a Soldier I supposed he was a Militia dragoon, because altho only five years old I remember his dragoon Cask with white horse hair in the crest. You may think it strange that I remember that fact, so I'll say why, on one occasion our house was surrounded by some stragling Indians so soon as they were discovered at a distance my Mother put the children in the loft of the log kitchen that stood at a short distance from the house, and when the Indians approached she held a parley with them from the *house*, no doubt to *draw* them from the *kitchen* We lay there all breathless until released by our Mother, during the parley she was once induced to come down to the door, which was secured by a strong Bar and chain, to give them some whisky, as they said they would go away if she would give them some, but as she attempted to open the door a little, one of them struck at her with a knife, but she closed the door by the Bar and his

knife stuck in the door, they soon after went away and we were released from our confinement. My Father returned home in an hour after their departure then it was I saw perhaps for the first time the evil passion of man get possession of him, he could scarcely be prevented by my mother from the folly of following them by himself, but she at length prevailed upon him to put on his uniform and collect his company, as there were too many of the Indians to be mastered by less than a dozen whites which she said he could soon collect. My Father accordingly set off on horseback in his (as I thought elegant) uniform, and in about two hours he again passed the house with 8 or 10 horsemen similarly dressed they were soon put on the trail by my Mother and away they went in pursuit of the Indians what became of the Indians I dont now remember, the impression however left on my mind is that they did not leave many of them to recount the adventures of their visit to our lonely dwelling which as well as I remember and from conversations with Genl Jackson and Judge Anderson the Comptroller must have been on the Holsten River at Campbells Station. Judge Anderson informed me that my Father was a Major in the Army with him, but did not know from which state but that he believed he was appointed in North Carolina. I know he was called Major by his old associates. When Burn's difficulty occurred or when Louisiana was taken possession of M^r Jefferson's Gun Boat system was put in operation my Father (who appears to have been something of a waterman) was appointed to the Command of one, No. 11, a schooner with the rank of Master, and my eldest brother had obtained a midshipman warrant and went to sea with him. Mounting four heavy guns, he was ordered immediately into service, and my mother was left to move the family down to New Orleans the next fall. By the direction of my Father a Keel Boat was built for us and our family floated down the river in it under the charge of a young man from Kentucky by the name of Merrill Brady; the next season in New Orleans was something like the present a most deadly yellow fever season and my mother fell a victim to it the children of whom there were five, were placed by my Father in different families to be brought up. It so happened that Com^{dr} Porters Father was on the same duty in New Orleans as my Father he was in wretched health and my father took him to his house, and my Mother nursed him as long as health permitted her, but it pleased the ruler of all things to take them both out of the world at the same time one by consumption, the other by yellow fever and they were both interred on the same day (so I have been told) for I was with the rest of the children removed from home and knew nothing of the sickness of my mother until she had been dead some time. Shortly after Com^{dr} Porter arrived to take command of the station, and learning the particulars of his Fathers death, insisted upon taking one of my Fathers children to bring up, he had just married and had no children. My Father consented provided he could induce either of us to go with him which by degrees he did my sister and myself lived with the Com^{dr} in New Orleans as long as he retained the station, and when he was relieved I em-

barked with him and my sister remained with his sister who had married Dr Heap the Navy Surgeon of the station. From that time to the day of his death Com^{dr} Porter was a father to me and I never saw my own father again. I was seven years old when I left home so that you see how little I could know of his life or character in fact all that I know I gathered from others. About 26 years ago while in Norfolk where I generally reside I received a message that there was a gentleman at the Hotel who wished to see me. I went down and an elderly gentleman introduced himself as the old and early friend of my Father and wished to see if I was "a sprig worthy of the Parent stock." It was Col M^r Kee then a member of Congress from Alabama, he informed me that a M^r Ogden, himself and my Father were the 3 first settlers of Tennessee, that they lived in a log cabin for some time (I dont remember how long) until my Father took it into his head that he would get married and that broke up their brotherhood he described my Father as belonging to Citadella in the island of Minorca (I am under the impression that my *grandfather* was from Citadella and *not* my Father but I may be wrong) he spoke of him as a man of great wrecklessness of character and just suited for the life of a Pioneer. I replied that he paid the forfeit of his wrecklessness life, that he had died of a cough contracted in that way when only 60 years of age at Pascagola in Mississippi, he had purchased a tract of land and located his family there. It was his habit to cross lake Pontchartrain in a small Boat and sleep on the Beach when night overtook him. I well remember his wrapping we children up in the boat sails on one of these trips only a short time before I left him. Yes said M^r Kee that was just like him, he was just as much at home on the water as on the land, he was a glorious Indian hunter, and a great provider in great straights for food. I did not think to ask Col M^r Kee to give me a little outline of what he knew of my Fathers life, and now deeply regret it. I have never been able to find any record of his services in the Army, altho Genl Jackson and Judge Anderson informed me that his appointment in the Navy was for his services in the Revolutionary War and the Judge told me he knew he was a Major at the same time he was he was called as if his name was spelt *Farragood*. I will write to my Brother who resides in New Orleans and perhaps he may know something that might be interesting. I left New Orleans with Com^{dr} Porter in 1809 and did not return there until 1823. I then made my sister a visit of 8 or ten days. I afterwards made them a visit of 2 weeks in 1838 so you see Sir how little I know of my Father or even my own family. I think he was born in 1755 and died at his residence at West Pascagoula in 1816 in his 61st year, he was in the battle of New Orleans but what part he bore I know not, I only know that if he had not borne an honorable part Genl Jackson would never have acknowledged him as a friend, or have been disposed to befriend his son as he ever did me. Thus Sir I have endeavored to give you all the little I know of my Father, and in so doing I have been compelled to give you a little of my own early history, and from that date up to the present

the Archives of the Navy dept contains my history which is but little more than a varied routine of cruizes on the stations in different parts of the world. "I have served (as the Tailor says in the Red Rover) in the seven bloody wars besides many others that have been talked of" and have thus far been preserved to the rank of a Commander in the Navy

With great respect

Your Obt Servant

D. G. FARRAGUT

P. S. This would have reached you sooner, but for mislaying of your letter, which deprived me of your address.

Respectfully

D. G. F.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit. Von GEORG GRUPP.
Band I., *Untergang der heidnischen Kultur.* (Munich: Allgemeine Verlagsgesellschaft m. b. H. 1903. Pp. x, 583.)

DR. GRUPP'S *Kulturgeschichte* is a commendable piece of work, temperate and well-proportioned. The statement of facts is clear, if not chronological in the strictest sense of the word. Directness and conciseness are among the most pleasing features of the work, the vast amount of material that the author has diligently brought together being condensed into 583 pages.

Civilization under the Roman Empire has frequently been the subject of historians, and naturally the question arises whether Dr. Grupp offers us anything new. His *Kulturgeschichte* is not a mere repetition of what Döllinger, Friedländer, Marquardt, Seeck, and others have offered us, but his purpose is to show us the civilization under the Roman emperors in a broader light, to compare it with the contemporary and later Christian civilization, to aim at the employment of the economic motif in a more general way, and to follow it in its progress and expansion. The work strikes one as an interesting picture of certain aspects of social life under the Empire.

Thirty chapters are devoted to such matters as the religion of the Romans, their education, homes, family life, institutions, emperors, officers, classes, agriculture, commerce, slavery, societies, and soldiers. Rome's relation to Greece, Asia, Egypt, and the Orient (including the Jews and their religion) is discussed in Chapters XXXI.-XXXIV. The next three chapters are given to the life of Jesus, the first Christian congregations, and the teaching of the apostles. Chapter XXXVIII. treats of the changes of the Roman character; and the remaining chapters deal with the Roman influence upon Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, etc., the military rule in foreign countries, colonization, and the religion of the frontier.

The short chapters on religion, life, and manners consist of jottings rather than a narrative. While imparting much information and displaying the author's talent for generalization as well as his keen analytical powers, these chapters do not aim at completeness. The book is perhaps not so much designed for the professional scholar as for intelligent readers of all classes who take an interest in by-gone ages, and who in such a book seek information that may guide them safely through the overwhelming mass of historical material. The foot-notes and references are numerous.

Christianity, so closely connected with the history of the Roman Empire, naturally could not be ignored in the *Kulturgeschichte*. In the latter part of the work the reader finds a constantly increasing proportion of ecclesiastical matters. While it is true that the work can be called the product of a broad-minded historian, it cannot be denied that Chapters XXXV.-XXXVII. are written rather from the standpoint of a Catholic theologian than from that of a historian. The chapter on Jesus seems to be disconnected, apparently having no relation to the others. The treatment of His life, while quite detailed, does not discuss adequately the relation of Christ to the Romans nor their attitude toward Him. Neither does it properly prepare us for an intelligible explanation regarding the moral standard of the age, the introduction of new creeds and rites, and the final change to another religion.

A second volume, to be published shortly, will deal with the development and expansion of Christianity, beginning with the fourth century. We are promised a bibliography in this volume. F. G. G. SCHMIDT.

L'Occident à l'Époque Byzantine, Goths et Vandales. Par F. MARTROYE. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1904. Pp. xii, 626.)

THE Byzantine epoch in the west extends, in Martroye's opinion, from the establishment of the Goths in Italy to the death of Justinian. Seven chapters of this work, accordingly, deal with the Gothic kingdom in Italy and its destruction. Two chapters describe the destruction of the kingdom of the Vandals and the invasion of Italy by the Franks after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom. Finally, there is a brief description of the Byzantine domination in Italy. The author has made a careful study of the sources, and quotes from them constantly and at length. He gives very few references to secondary books, and his volume leaves the impression that he is not familiar with the recent researches in this field.

The most interesting portions of the book are the descriptions of Theodoric's character, policy, and government. M. Martroye's study has led him to take a much less favorable view of the Gothic hero than the one to which Voltaire, Gibbon, Herder, and Laurent have given currency. Probably we have been prone to exaggerate the merits of Theodoric, but M. Martroye is inclined to depreciate them unduly. He attributes to Theodoric the bombastic rhetoric in the letters of Cassiodorus: "Et toute cette déclamation se termine par l'ordre, donné à Symmaque, la future victime des Goths, d'étayer, à l'aide de piliers, les voûtes croulantes du théâtre et d'y faire les restaurations que la sécurité du public rendait indispensables. De simples piliers, après de si pompeuses exagérations, voilà, en un mot, tout le système de Théodoric" (p. 88). He considers that the wise and just actions of Theodoric were due either to the influence of his secretary, or else to the cunning policy of a barbarian. Two passages from his final judgment of Theodoric (pp. 153, 154) will show his point of view:

Le règne de Théodoric fut moins glorieux qu'on ne s'est plu à le dire sur la foi de ses panégyristes. Ce conquérant que quelques décrets promulgués pour la conservation des monuments de Rome et beaucoup de rhétorique ont fait considérer comme le restaurateur de la civilisation, ne fut que le chef heureux d'une armée victorieuse. Il ne comprit ni les circonstances, ni les hommes du milieu où l'avait placé le succès de ses armes et ne sut rien fonder de durable. . . . Quand, dans sa lutte contre Clovis, sa diplomatie se trouva vaine, le barbare reparut en lui ; il se contenta de partager avec les Francs le royaume d'Alaric dont il avait entrepris la défense. Quand il reconnut que des dissertations archéologiques, des éloges du passé et de belles promesses ne suffisaient point pour faire illusion aux Romains et aux catholiques, il n'eut plus souci de tous ses beaux principes ; ce fut en barbare qu'il agit aussitôt, par l'oppression et par la violence.

M. Martroye argues in several passages that the *Secret History* could not have been written by Procopius. His arguments are few and inconclusive. He is apparently unacquainted with the work done by Dahn, Panchenko, and Hauray, whose arguments prove beyond reasonable doubt that Procopius was the author of the *Secret History*. Martroye's attitude on this subject is possibly the most striking illustration of his neglect of secondary work. He quotes at great length the speeches which Procopius attributed to various characters, arguing (p. 554), "Les discours que Procope prête aux généraux de l'armée impériale et à Totila, doivent être considérés comme ayant une valeur historique. Procope raconte des événements auxquels il a eu part et il a pu être très exactement renseigné, même au sujet des proclamations des chefs ennemis." This may be true, but it is always doubtful whether we ought to place much reliance in such rhetorical exercises, which are the commonplace of all classical historians. Martroye in the same note continues, "Quant aux discours qu'Agathias prête aux Goths, ils ne sont, peut-être, que des amplifications de rhétorique"; but he quotes the speeches of Agathias.

These points are criticized because the book is useful, but must be used with caution. It owes its chief importance, as the publishers state correctly in their advertisement "à l'emploi constant des sources originales". In this respect the book deserves great praise ; the narrative is formed almost entirely by weaving together the statements of the various authorities. Even when the author has formed his own opinion, as in the case of Theodoric, he is too honest to suppress the passages which conflict with this opinion. Consequently the volume is one to be consulted by every student of the period of the migrations.

DANA CARLETON MUNRO.

A History of England. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College. (Boston : Allyn and Bacon. 1903. Pp. xx, 588.)

It is the high merit of this work that it is at once a model text-book and a scholarly history of Great Britain. "If there be a form of historical writing supposedly peculiar to text-books," declares the author,

"I have made no effort to find it or to use it." To the progressive teacher these words are full of promise, for the mechanically compiled and artificially written text-book is becoming a positive hindrance to the use of right method in our schools. The teacher may rejoice in a book which is not ostentatiously written down to the youth's supposed capacity. The thin diet too often served is enervating to both pupil and teacher. The stronger meat that Professor Andrews has wisely provided will prove an intellectual tonic.

The apparatus of the book is very satisfactory. Besides the twenty genealogical tables, there are seventeen maps and seventy-four illustrations. The maps have been prepared with great care, and some of them are unique in character. Thus the sixth shows the territorial claims of England in France at seven epochs between 1154 and 1453; while the fifteenth, in three parts, discloses the extent of British India at the end of the Seven Years' War, in 1850, and at the present hour. The portraits of celebrated men and women and the pictures of contemporary things must, in the hands of the alert teacher, become a powerful adjunct to the narrative. But it is the bibliographical helps that will prove most fruitful in promoting right methods of study and teaching. Thus the foot-notes, besides the critical and other supplementary matter, contain systematic references to the source-books, which will encourage the use, at least as illustration, of the more important original documents in English history; while the references at the close of each chapter, affording a view of the choicest literature of each epoch, will give a deeper and broader meaning to historical study. Indeed, without the two elements of sources and bibliography, the problems of history will be pretty sure to elude the reader's attention; and the "conversion of narrative into problems" is the very soul of scientific historical teaching.

The book covers the history, not merely of England in connection with Scotland and Ireland, but also that of the Indian and colonial empire. Special stress is laid upon institutions and upon social and industrial conditions. The text is divided into thirteen chapters, the first four of which deal with the period before the Norman conquest. The author has done well in devoting a distinct chapter to "Anglo-Saxon Institutions", thus gaining unity and emphasis for his treatment. The results of recent research are cautiously utilized, especially in the enlightening discussion of the land system. In this chapter as elsewhere, on disputed points Professor Andrews has decided opinions and does not hesitate to express them. Thus we are told that "The word *shire* is not derived from *share*, as is frequently asserted"; and that the t^{un} or vill "had no political importance", being "rarely mentioned in the laws".

The entire treatment of the subject is remarkably uniform and well balanced. Everywhere it reveals the hand, not of a compiler, but of a scholar who writes from the sources, with a full knowledge of the monographic literature. Here there is of course space only for a passing notice of a few typical passages. In the fifth chapter, devoted to the Norman conquest, one is at once attracted by the discussion of William's feudal

land system, whose peculiar features are knight-service, scattered holdings of the great vassals, and the oath of allegiance to the king as their chief lord exacted from all landholders. Through the oath at Salisbury in 1086 "William violated the recognized feudal principle that a vassal owed allegiance to his immediate lord only. But he could do this without danger, because as king he was able to enforce a rule that as feudal lord he would hardly have dared to make." Regarding the other means for preventing "feudalism in England from developing its worst aspects, — the territorial independence of great lords, and private war" — the author declares, contrary to the usual teaching, that the scattering of estates "was due not to any design of the Conqueror, but to the slowness of the conquest". The reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. are discussed in the seventh chapter. The good work of the friars, the career of Simon, the rise of Parliament, and especially the great statutes of Edward receive the attention which they deserve. So likewise in the next chapter industrial and social conditions — the Black Death and its economic results, the manorial system, the work of Wycliffe, and the Peasant Revolt — are given the relative space which the modern student requires. For the concise account of the peasant rising recent investigations have been faithfully used, especially the notable researches of Dr. Kriehn.

A conservative view is taken of Cromwell's place in history. The ordinances for the reorganization and strengthening of the kingdom show him "to have been a statesman of large powers". But he "cannot be called a great statesman, because he did not consistently plan for the future, and because he did not adapt his government to the wishes of the people of all England. . . . His experiments in constitutional government were a failure, because they were made in the interest of the Puritan party and never of the nation." This last statement will scarcely be accepted as axiomatic by all students of Cromwell's work. It is true that his legal and constitutional reforms were undone at the Restoration; but, whether or not they prove that Cromwell was a great statesman, they should receive even more relative attention than Dr. Andrews has given them, if the real significance of the Puritan Revolution would be understood. The measures even of the despised Barebone — not "Barebones" — Parliament are worthy of serious study. It was that body, for instance, which adopted the Civil Marriage Act of 1653, an ordinance of extraordinary interest, anticipating the essential features of the civil marriage laws now existing in England and the United States.

In the discussion of the British policy toward the American colonies we are told that the "more excitable of the colonial orators raised the cry of 'no taxation without representation'; but it is hard to see what good could have been done by a few men elected in the colonies and sent three thousand miles to sit in a parliament that was thoroughly corrupt and represented no one except the men who bought the votes of the electors." This statement is not helpful, if it is meant to suggest that such was the real aspect which the problem of taxation took in the minds of the majority of the leaders of the Revolution, although at first Benja-

min Franklin was the chief of the "excitable" orators who favored a plan of American representation in Parliament. Again, it is asserted that from the time of the Revolution onward the "old colonial system, characterized by navigation acts and restrictive measures, ceased to exist in fact, though not in law. This change came about, not because of any lesson taught by the American Revolution, but because the old system had outlived its usefulness." It is indeed marvelous if the loss of an American empire had no decisive influence in demonstrating to the English people the uselessness of the old colonial system.

Strong as is this book in dealing with institutions and social questions, one could wish that somewhat more space had been given to them in the modern period. The present forms of local organization and administration and the rise of the system of cabinet-parliamentary government are not considered. A chapter on existing institutions would have been the natural complement of the one on that subject for the Anglo-Saxon period. Moreover, the struggle for the emancipation of workers in mines and factories deserves more than a passing remark; and the great services of the seventh earl of Shaftesbury are as worthy of notice as those of Bright, Cobden, or Russell.

These shortcomings, if they be shortcomings—due doubtless to economy of space—must not be suffered to conceal the great merit of this book. It is written in a simple and pleasing style; and the narrative is so closely knit, following the natural evolution of the subject, that the attention of the reader never flags. It is what not many text-books are—a real contribution to historical literature; and it should prove a powerful influence in advancing the scientific study of English history in the high-school and the college.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

The Mediæval Stage. By E. K. CHAMBERS. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1903. Two vols., pp. xlii, (2), 419; v, (3), 480.)

THIS work has to do with acting rather than with literature; it is a history of the stage, not a history of drama. The period is the rather late mediæval extended even through the sixteenth century. Its actual scope is more English than general in spite of the very full illustrative material from other lands with which the author leads up to his English theme. The standpoint is neither that of the playwright nor of the player, but of the folklorist and student of customs.

The text is divided into four books; on minstrelsy, folk drama, religious drama, and the interlude. More than half the space is given to the folk drama and more than half the remainder to the religious drama. A thirty-page list of authorities and a number of valuable appendixes take up about one-fourth of the work.

Under minstrelsy the author touches on the complete downfall of the theaters through ecclesiastical hostility and barbarian indifference. He goes on to show that the popular love of spectacles nevertheless endured, as is shown by the flourishing state of minstrelsy. He shows further that

the spectacles and the remarkable variety of popular games, but especially the dance, have their definitely dramatic side as developed in the May-games, the sword-dances, the feast of fools, and the boy bishops. These "gave birth to a special type of the drama in the mask". Popular games were frowned on by the church, but in the end it was the church itself which did most to satisfy the mimetic instincts of the people. The liturgical drama developed remarkably within the church, "migrated from the church to the market-place", and thence "still farther to the banqueting-hall". From the hands of the clergy it passed to those of the folk, still retaining its religious character, and thence into the hands of a professional class of actors, putting off its religious character and taking on new aspects under the influence of humanism. In brief, modern drama arose from "the ecclesiastical liturgy, the farce of the mimes, the classical revivals of humanism".

All parts are wrought out in a workmanlike manner, showing excellent scholarly equipment, good command of the literature of the subject, and thorough method in the use of sources, but the most loving as well as the most extensive treatment is that given to the folk drama. Here the author's interest leads him to be somewhat discursive at times. An elaborate evolutionary theory of religion has its justification in the attempt to trace to the ritual of religion the form of the dramatic elements of the popular festivals — the folk dance from the ritual and from the dance the folk drama. But this fullness is hardly needed for the argument, and the argument itself seems sometimes a little touched with that spirit of fantasy which besets the best of folklorists — and Mr. Chambers is of the soberest. This portion on folk drama is, however, to say the least, a rich gathering of illustrative facts on the general subject of the popular instinct for dramatic play out of which has grown the organized modern drama, and it is a genuine contribution to the understanding of the folk-psychology which forms the basis of that development. In his treatment of the religious drama and the interlude the author is more in touch with the familiar line of tradition, but contributes much fresh material and very full enrichment of the usual matter.

In the matter of fullness Mr. Chambers leaves little to be desired, unless one is disposed to criticize his almost entire neglect of the subject of "dialogued speech", to which he himself refers as, with symbolism and mimetic action, "the other important factor" of dramatic development. This theme might well have formed a new section or at least chapters under folk drama and religious drama. It was the almost universal practice of the late middle ages to put in dialogue form whatever was intended for the people. In the thirteenth century even sermons and encyclopedias (like the "*Livre des secrets*" and the work of the "philosopher Sidrach"), and in fact most things written in the vernacular, were dialogued. The dialogued sermons such as those of Berthold, Voragine, Tauler, Geiler, and others were a definite appeal to the dramatic instincts of the people. The most suggestive survival of the dialogue sermon, the curiously interesting and effective preaching of the

Dotto and the *Ignorante* by the Jesuit fathers in Rome to-day, is distinctly dramatic and is dramatically performed by two preachers, one of whom imitates the man of the people and even talks in the Roman dialect. Some allusion is made by Chambers to the use of dialogue by the minstrels and in Christian writings, etc., but there is no real treatment of this field.

The work stands superficial tests for accuracy very well indeed, in spite of the fact that it fails the first tests put — Voragine did not die in 1275 (II. 126) but in 1298, and the Coventry Weaver's play was not burned with Sharp's collection, although its rediscovery at Coventry by H. Craig (to whose forthcoming edition of the plays Chambers refers) is too recent for use here. Moreover, "a knowledge of Seneca or of Plautus" is not quite "the rarest of things" (II. 207), at least in the thirteenth century, if one may judge from certain writers of this period whom the reviewer happens to be reading at the time of writing this review, for they make quotations by the score from both these writers. But, considering the immense mass and variety of material crowded into this work, the tests reveal surprisingly few slips or inaccuracies.

The book is written in a style which makes interesting reading in spite of the necessary scholarly references and the unnecessary peppering with quasi-technical words given in their originals as if untranslatable. On the whole the work is one not only attractive and profitable to read but useful also as an introductory guide, and that not merely to the subject in general but also to the multitudinous special topics introduced under each general theme.

In the matter of bibliographical reference, the thirty-page list of authorities at the beginning is a somewhat miscellaneous list of books consulted, with much that is only indirect in its bearing, but it is useful enough; and the bibliographical notes at the beginnings of chapters and in foot-notes are models of practical bibliographical method. The make-up of the book with its handsome typography and unusually light paper is very pleasing. Not least among its attractions is the fact that the well-proportioned margins are not too wide and the fair-sized type and leadings are not excessive. It is a normal book, not watered either by author or publisher and not condensed beyond nature. The only suspicion of skimping is in the index and this, although made on a somewhat meager plan, is intelligently made and fills the decent amount of nineteen pages.

ERNEST C. RICHARDSON.

The Angevin Empire, or the Three Reigns of Henry II., Richard I., and John (A. D., 1154-1216). By SIR JAMES H. RAMSAY, of Bamff, M.A. (London: Swan, Sonnenschein, and Company, Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv, 556.)

This is the last instalment of Sir James H. Ramsay's great work. It covers the combined reigns of the first three Angevins, and thus

brings the reader down to the death of John, A. D. 1216. The scope of the work, however, is not so broad as the title might lead one to suppose. What little space is devoted to constitutional or social questions is given almost entirely to England. Even Ireland receives only meager treatment, while that vast agglomeration of lordships which was held by English kings as vassals of foreign overlords, and which yet formed such an important part of the "Angevin Empire", is neglected almost altogether. On the other hand, the author has followed with characteristic industry the Angevin kings in their ceaseless goings and comings, their never-ending itineraries, as far as it is possible to restore or confirm, — a species of historical investigation which, although of little interest to the general reader, is of considerable importance to the student, especially if the work is done well and finally. Whether Sir James has attained this end or not can be determined only by a careful examination of his processes. In the main it may be said that upon almost every page he gives evidence of the same patient industry, the same devotion to accuracy in matters of detail, the same conscientious fidelity in the description of events, that have placed the *Foundations of England* in the class with the best models of the modern school of history-writers.

The author's purpose, as he modestly states in his preface, has been to verify and confirm by an independent survey of the original authorities, and to present "facts rather than impressions". Hence he has no brilliant discoveries to announce; no novel and startling interpretations of old texts to exploit; no slashing criticisms to develop. He is always conservative in exposition, clinging tenaciously to old and accepted views, and surrendering them when he must always with reluctance.

In his estimate of men and actions the author rarely betrays enthusiasm; he always looks at his heroes through an inverted glass. His Henry II. is a busy king, whose feverish activities never cease; he is as tireless as a fiend, but he is far from the statesman-sovereign whose picture Stubbs has drawn with such a masterly hand in his introduction to the so-called Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough. According to Sir James, Henry's statecraft has no higher inspiration than an innate love of power, directed in later years by the immediate purpose of finding portions for his graceless sons. It is, therefore, petty and short-sighted; and in the end is defeated by the very sons whom he would favor. He is ignorant of human nature, and has little knowledge of the economic or social forces which surround him. All in all, for the student of constitutional institutions his reign is a dismal failure. As might be expected, where the father fails to secure favor, Richard fares worse. Even his title to respect as a master of the art of war is denied him; although Sir James does betray some enthusiasm when describing the conduct of the battle of "Arsûf". For John, however, the author has only contempt: far from being "the ablest and most ruthless of the Angevins", John is a lusterless tyrant, hopelessly depraved, and without ability either in war or politics to redeem the fathomless evil of his nature. For the less con-

spicuous figures whose names are connected with the Angevin history the author has more patience but hardly more admiration. Becket is a martyr but no saint; "with all his Biblical jargon he fought as a politician", and in a bad cause. For Hubert Walter or William Marshal the author has slight respect; their faithful service of bad masters is not to their credit. Even Langton, the traditional hero of the Great Charter, appears, if not a self-willed egoist as Becket, at least as a church-seeking prelate who rises no whit above the selfish interests of his class.

Upon most of the disputed points connected with the Angevin era the author is inclined to take conservative ground. He sustains Bémont against Guilhiermoz in rejecting the second condemnation of John, but refuses to follow Miss Norgate in rejecting the first condemnation. In discussing the origin of trial by jury, he thinks that Pollock and Maitland have been too ready to "bow to German authorities", and while conceding to Brunner the continental origin of the inquest by royal writ, he insists upon the direct connection of the accusing thanes of Ethelred's time with the sworn inquisitors of Henry II., who thus "present a link between the jurors of the old English gemot and the modern grand jury".

Upon either of these questions Sir James certainly has a right to his view, and his position will doubtless receive due consideration from the scholars who continue the investigation of these topics. In discussing the alleged grant of Ireland to Henry by Pope Adrian, however, the author fairly lays himself open to the charge of unfamiliarity with recent literature upon this subject. The Bull of Adrian, he says, "has been fiercely assailed, for very obvious reasons, by zealous Romanists, and patriotic Irishmen". True enough, but is this all? The author ought to know that the men who have destroyed the credibility of the famous bull are neither "zealous Romanists" nor "patriotic Irishmen". He is evidently familiar with Mr. Round's essay in *The Commune of London*, but in a marvelous foot-note on page 7 he virtually confesses that he has read neither Scheffer-Boichorst nor Pflugk-Harttung. The simple *credo* of Sir James, therefore, in which he announces his unqualified acceptance of *Laudabiliter*, can have little weight. His position, moreover, is hardly strengthened by the further statement: "even if it [the bull] should prove to be a concoction there would still remain ample evidence that the Papacy was accessory, both before and after the fact, to the invasion of Ireland by Henry." Here the author certainly shifts his case to firmer ground, for it was long ago shown conclusively by Scheffer-Boichorst that the question of the spuriousness of *Laudabiliter* is entirely distinct from the question of papal responsibility. But unfortunately Mr. Ramsay's "ample evidence" has also been thoroughly sifted, and not only has Adrian been freed from all responsibility for the English seizure of Ireland, but it has been further shown that after the English had taken forcible possession, Henry tried in vain to persuade three successive popes to confirm his title.

In his treatment of the Becket controversy the author appears to write not in the dignified temper of the historian, but with the animus of

the polemical writer. In the preface, in fact, he coolly avows that in obedience to the demands of the times, he proposes to use the Becket matter to show to the world what the words, "the Liberty of the Church", imported when those words had a living meaning. Now, without questioning Sir James's judgment of Becket, it does not follow that Becket's view of "the liberties of the church" was the accepted view in the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, few of the English bishops supported Becket; even Alexander evidently regarded him as a troublesome radical to be restrained rather than encouraged, while later popes, noticeably Innocent III., expressly rejected the principle upon which Becket based his whole contention. The decree of Innocent is the law of the Roman church to-day.

The animus of the author toward things or persons churchly is still more apparent in his treatment of Langton and the Charter; and whatever may be the reader's concurrence in the use which the author would make of the Becket controversy, few will follow him here. Sir James declares that the provisions of the Charter which pertained to the church were "sweeping and extravagant. Archbishop Langton had not given his support to the Barons for nothing. The first words of the Charter proclaim the absolute 'liberty' of the Church in the fullest sense. This 'liberty', as then understood, involved the surrender of all that Henry II. had contended for in his Constitutions of Clarendon; it would relieve the clergy of all lay control, and of all liability to contribute to the needs of the State beyond the occasional scutages due from the higher clergy for their knights' fees. The clergy would be in the happy position of having their property and rights protected for them *gratis*, by Courts whose decisions if adverse to themselves they would be free to reject. The grant of the absolute 'liberty' of the Church, with the free canonical election already granted and now expressly confirmed, would establish a self-elected corporation as the ruling power in the Kingdom" (p. 475). Prejudice could hardly go farther than this, if not in misstating, surely in misunderstanding the spirit and purpose of historical action. As a matter of fact, never at any time were the words "liberty of the church" so closely or so explicitly defined. In one generation they meant one thing, in another, another thing, as the church was compelled to defend some new point along the line of its activities against the encroachment of royal or baronial tyrannies. With few exceptions the stand taken by the champions of church liberties has been justified by the modern world, because, as Palgrave long ago put it, "The liberties of the Church were the franchises of the nation." Neither the Charter of November nor the Great Charter of June following warrant us in believing that Langton sought any such results as Sir James here recounts. If any man of the thirteenth century had a definite conception of what the words "liberty of the church" meant, that man was Innocent III.; and Innocent would have been the last to reject the archbishop of his own making for committing himself to the service of "the liberties of the church". But Innocent suspended Langton and left a successor to reinstate him;

and the inference certainly is just, that the humiliation of Langton was due not to the fact that he favored the liberties of the church, but to the fact that he had championed the liberties of England against the tyrannies of the pope's new vassal — the impossible John. It is true that the Constitutions of Clarendon had been nominally dropped by Henry as a result of the tragic end of the Becket matter, and yet, within two years of the death of Becket, Henry had secured the right of the forest courts to try and to punish clerks for breaches of the forest laws, and from that time the civil courts had quietly but steadily resumed the jurisdiction of clerical cases of various kinds, until in the thirteenth century the final authority of the church courts was recognized only in a few capital cases. In John's day the question of civil jurisdiction was virtually settled, and among the grievances brought forth by the church the encroachments of the civil courts upon the church courts is not mentioned. In Edward I.'s reign, as we near the end of the century, we shall find another archbishop, Winchelsea, boldly claiming that church-land ought to be exempt from taxation by the state, and still later, on the eve of the final severance from Rome, we shall find Archbishop Warham virtually declaring the legislative independence of the church from the national parliament. Yet in Langton's day such issues were entirely remote to men's thoughts, nor did the term "liberty of the church" mean anything more than exemption from the shameless plundering of John or exemption from direct royal interference in ecclesiastical elections. As for the rest, the taxing of church property or the abuse of jurisdiction, Langton apparently was perfectly willing to cast in his lot with the nation and find protection under the general provisions of the Charter, which secured the liberties of the church to be sure, but no more than it did the liberties of the barons or the burghers.

In treating of the homage of John and the promised tribute, Mr. Ramsay has overworked the evidences of national humiliation and mortification. Neither of his authorities, Walter of Coventry or Matthew of Paris, is strictly contemporary. Both were bitterly antipapal and wrote out of the midst of the fires of the thirteenth century, when the papal overlordship had become a very patent and a very irritating fact. There is no evidence that in the early part of the century there had been yet quickened in England any of the later bitter antipapal feeling. On the contrary, the barons at the time of the homage of John regarded the affair with no ill-favor, and later at the time of the papal interference in the affair of the Charter virtually claimed in their protest against Innocent's action that they had forced John to enter into the new vassal relation. Up to this point, in fact, they apparently regarded the pope as their best protector against the tyrannies of John. Forty years later, however, when papal interference and papal exaction had taught them to look upon the church with anything but filial affection, men began to talk of "humiliation" and "mortification".

The peculiarities of Sir James Ramsay's style are so well known that it is hardly necessary to refer to them again. The book is sadly in need

of careful editing. It is to be regretted that when an author has evidently spent so much labor in the effort to secure accuracy of detail, his work should be marred by careless proof-reading. The text is fairly clear, but some of the foot-notes are beyond description. For example, see the note on page 7, where not only are the names of Scheffer-Boichorst and Pflugk-Harttung misspelled, but four other errors also appear in the titles of the periodicals in which their respective essays occur, nor is either date of publication given correctly.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898. Edited by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES A. ROBERTSON. Vol. VII., 1588-1591; Vol. VIII., 1591-1593; Vol. IX., 1593-1597. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1903. Pp. 320, 320, 329.)

TAKEN as a whole, Volume VII. presents us more enlightening data as to the early history of the Philippines under Spain than any of those that have preceded it in the series. This is due primarily to its containing the celebrated relations by Friar Juan de Plasencia of the "Customs of the Tagalogs" (1589); the letters to the king and his Council of the Indies from Bishop Salazar, Santiago de Vera, and other members of the first audiencia, and the king's careful instructions to Gomez Perez Dasmariñas.

There are so many points of probability in his favor that we can hardly resist giving the palm to Bishop Salazar in his controversy with the lay conquerors who have become *encomenderos* of natives (having districts of from 1,500 to 10,000 population assigned to them), charging them with abuse and even torture of the Indians in order to secure their annual tributes of one peso, and, with few exceptions, of giving them nothing in return in the way of protection or instruction (through missionaries). Unfortunately the peppery bishop has left us, even on paper, very fair proof that most of the charges brought against him by the other parties to the controversy were true. He engaged in petty wrangles over precedence with the first audiencia; he interfered with the civil jurisdiction of the king, and for the first time brought to bear a weapon that for long thereafter should play a large part in securing ecclesiastical domination of the Philippines, *viz.*, excommunication; he refused absolution and condemned men to hell who did not act in accordance with his views; he conspired with his brother Dominicans to oust the Augustinians from their mission-work among the Chinese in Manila, and gain it and a future entrance into China for his own order; he patronizingly praised the king for sending a new governor to replace the man with whom he had quarreled, then promptly quarreled with the new-comer; and he lectured the king when the latter issued decrees not to his liking. All this is not incompatible with the truth of his charge against the *encomenderos*, and the probability is that he exaggerated very little in saying, "Through their presence, [they] work more injury to the Indians by the many grievances which they occasion, and the bad

example which they set, than the latter are advantaged in being thus pacified." But, on the other hand, we cannot overlook Dasmariñas's careful investigation and sober statements as to the insufficient number of missionaries and their inadequacy to the work, as conquest was extended by the *encomenderos*, among whom he finds some good. And we have to remember that the Jesuits, already disgruntled by the bishop's disposition to give all the plums to his own order, cautiously hint that, so far as oppression of the people goes, the friar-priests are already (1591) collecting in the larger parishes 800 to 1,000 pesos, besides their fees, which are held so high for marriages that concubinage is fostered.

The Plasencia relations as to the customs of the Tagalogs are standard sources of reference as to the pre-conquest natives. The reader new to Philippina should be warned that, though among the best of the few scanty sources of information on this line, Plasencia is neither complete nor always accurate, and that, at most, he studied the institutions of slavery, marriage, priesthood, etc., from a rather limited experience in the vicinity of Manila, where customs were already corrupted and adulterated. Modern scientific research among the wild tribes of northern Luzon and Mindanao and among some of the present-day Moros will soon begin to give us a better insight into the state of the pre-conquest Filipinos than any of the early Spanish writings. None the less, Plasencia's relations must always be consulted by every student of the subject, though of less value than Antonio de Morga's book of 1609, to be reproduced later in this series. The editors have followed the text given in Santa Inés's *Crónica* (Franciscan order). In 1892 Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, now a member of the American Philippine Commission, published Plasencia's relations in pamphlet form in Madrid, with notes.

The decree of Philip II. against slavery has appeared in the series previously. In Volume VIII. we find Pope Gregory XIV. taking a hand in the question upon the representations of Bishop Salazar and issuing a bull (1591) in which the prohibition of slavery is definitely proclaimed. This prohibition is worthy of attention, especially on the part of the citizens of a republic wherein slavery was not finally and formally abolished for two and three-quarters centuries afterward. As a matter of actual fact, however, we have to take into account that to the very close of Spanish rule the masses of the Philippine people were virtually held in serfdom by landed companies or by individuals, Spanish or half-castes, and that the greatest obstacle to the implantation in the Philippine communities of to-day of self-governing institutions is the "caciquism", whereby in every village a few men of property and more or less education hold the rest of the population under an inherited despotism, imposed by ignorance and by a slavery to the soil or to personal debt.

Not the least curious of the old documents that make up Volumes VIII. and IX. are those relating to a very minute inquiry made at Manila into the right of the Spaniards to conduct warlike operations against the savage natives then inhabiting the Zambales Mountains and their foot-

hills, kindred of the head-hunting Igorrotes still existing in the Cordillera Central of Luzon. Undoubtedly Governor Dasmariñas was led to invite this inquiry on the part of the heads of the orders and of other ecclesiastical authorities in Manila because of the previous criticism of all the doings of the lay conquerors in their relations with the natives. It is, however, none the less amusing to note how, thirty years after the Spaniards had begun to force their authority and their religion upon a strange and more or less unwilling people, who along the sea-coasts and rivers had attained to some degree of culture, they paused over the question of making reprisals forcibly upon bands of savages from the hills who preyed on their towns and prowled about seeking their heads and the heads of some of their lowland converts. The friars having found justification for such procedure in the queer blend of canonical law and political precedents that made up the international law of the Catholic countries in the middle ages, the process of punishing the head-hunters was solemnly authorized.

Each of these two volumes has a document of some importance as bearing upon the population of the Philippines at the time of the conquest and upon the rapidity and general character of the conquest itself. The more valuable of these two documents is the extensive memorandum sent to the king in 1591 by Governor Dasmariñas, containing a summary of the territory then held and the number of people tributary. This report, together with that made by the friar Ortega in 1594, shows that the large island of Mindanao and the important islands of Samar, Palawan, and Mindoro were as yet virtually untouched by lay or ecclesiastical conquerors; that Bohol, Leyte, and Negros were known to the Spaniards only in spots; that the greater part of Panay was still unexplored, and even Cebu was scarcely reached outside of the little section on which the Spaniards had first landed under Magellan and afterward settled under Legaspi; and that a large part of Luzon, especially in the north and in the mountainous central part, remained to be investigated by the white man. The lay conquerors seemed everywhere to have preceded the missionaries. Leyte, says Ortega, has been paying tribute for twenty years, and has never had a missionary nor any religious instruction. Negros, Palawan, Mindoro, Bohol, and Mindanao, where some few tributes were being collected, had then never seen a friar. Panay, with a population of 100,000 (probably an underestimate), had but six centers of missionary work, with fourteen friars in all. Cebu had none at all outside of the city of Cebu. In the small islands between Luzon and the main body of the Visayas, the collectors of tribute were active, but the missionaries had not yet begun work. Not half of Luzon was reached by teachers of religion, thousands of people, subjects of Spain so far as paying tribute went, never having seen as yet any other representatives of Spain than the *encomenderos* and their soldiers. In 1591 there were 140 missionaries in all the islands, as against 236 *encomenderos*. The civil government even had *alcaldes-mayor* (judges with executive functions also) over regions where the natives were not yet all Christianized.

These documents shed light on two questions of present interest. First, they point to a considerably larger population for the Philippines at the time of the conquest than the church historians have been willing to give them. Proceeding upon the earliest parish records, they have usually assigned the archipelago a pre-conquest population of one-half to three-quarters of a million. Considering the population reported by Dasmariñas, with large and important portions of the archipelago either unknown or little known, it is certainly impossible to put the figures below a million; these and other data available for the early periods may warrant an extension of this estimate to beyond two millions. The friar historians have assumed that the early parish records included practically all the inhabitants, except those of the mountainous regions and the Moro country, this assumption being based upon the constantly repeated assertion that the friar-missionaries themselves made the early conquests and preceded civil authority in all parts of the archipelago. It is upon this, as a second point, that the facts noted above very plainly bear.

It was in consequence of the representations of the bishop and the governor that the king in 1594 sent out 154 friars and in 1595 110 more. The king's instructions to Tello, the new governor sent to succeed Dasmariñas; the documents relating to the ill-planned expeditions to Siam and Cambodia, where rival rulers were at war, and to the conquests along the Rio Grande of Mindanao; the cautious correspondence of the son of Dasmariñas, temporarily serving as governor, with the great shogun of Japan, Hideyoshi, and the conflicting claims before the king relative to the trade with the orient—these are all matters which, though but hinted at, indicate that these volumes hold interest both for the historian and for the student of current affairs.

There are various photographic facsimiles of the signatures to documents reproduced in the series, and Volume IX. contains also two representations of the coat of arms of the city of Manila in early times and a curious map of Luzon, Formosa, and a part of China by one of the Spanish navigators (1597). Beginning with Volume VI., the succeeding volumes have shown a broader grasp of the work in hand and a better selection of materials. In the lesser details, too, there has been improvement.

JAMES A. LE ROY.

Madame de Montespan. By H. NOEL WILLIAMS. (New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Pp. xii, 384.)

MR. WILLIAMS has followed his life of Madame de Pompadour by the history of another royal favorite. The book is luxurious in form and is embellished by excellent portraits. The paper is of the best quality and the margins are broad. By some subtle association of ideas it seems appropriate to portray the life of a profligate woman in an ornate book. Vice often has a gilded exterior in literature as in life.

Mr. Williams has done his work well. He is familiar with the literature of the period, and in what he says, not only of the heroine of his story, but of Louis XIV. and of the other persons who figured in the

loves of the great king, there is little to criticize. There is, perhaps, less reason for a life of Madame de Montespan than for one of Madame de Pompadour. Whatever were the vices of the Pompadour, she was an important figure in French history; she influenced French policy; she was an uncrowned queen with more power than is possessed by most queens that are crowned. It can be said to the credit of Louis XIV. that while the objects of his affection were numerous, none of them, with the possible exception of Madame de Maintenon, were allowed to interfere with the performance of his duties as a ruler. There is nothing to show that Madame de Montespan had either the ability or the desire for any such rôle, even if it had been possible. She belonged to the worst type of royal favorites. The king was not obliged, in order to bring about her downfall, to exert the personal attractions which he undoubtedly possessed. She sought him instead of being sought, angled for her own seduction, and gloried in her shame. She had no desire to be the secret possessor of the monarch's affections, but wished to be a *maitresse déclarée* and to receive an obsequious adulation not always given to the king's wife; she wanted money and jewelry for herself, pensions and positions for her illegitimate children. She was a lady of ancient lineage and charming manners, but at heart as vulgar as Madame du Barry.

Such as she was, she is fairly portrayed by Mr. Williams. He does not exaggerate her charms, though he does somewhat exaggerate her vices. The book contains a review, not indeed of the entire administration of Louis XIV., but of a portion of it by no means unimportant, the love adventures of that amatory monarch. Not only of Madame de Montespan, but of Louise de la Vallière, Fontanges, and many other favorites of the monarch an account is given. If one desires to read in fair and agreeable form that chapter of the reign of Louis XIV., this work will enable him to do so.

The chief criticism on its historical accuracy must be based on the account which Mr. Williams gives of the connection of Madame de Montespan with the poisoning scandals of the time, to which he attributes her final loss of Louis XIV.'s affection and esteem. The evidence upon which he founds this opinion is found in the Archives de la Bastille, and in attaching importance to it we think Mr. Williams shows that he follows in the footsteps of Michelet rather than of Freeman. Legal training is not without value to a historical writer. If it teaches him nothing else, it teaches him the worthlessness of much of human evidence. Most of the testimony in the la Voisin poisonings under Louis XIV. was of the same value as that given by Titus Oates in the Popish Plots under Charles II. Of the depositions that accused Madame de Montespan, some were given under torture, and we regret to say that Mr. Williams seems to attach weight to statements thus elicited. The most of the story was told by the lying daughter of a condemned woman, who indulged in the device so common among frightened witnesses, of fabricating impossible crimes against persons of prominence. The evidence against Madame de

Montespan was not enough to authorize a jury to convict a habitual criminal of petty larceny.

Louis XIV. was not a man of brilliant mind, but he was a man of good sense. It is not possible that he believed such a farrago of nonsense, or was persuaded that Madame de Montespan had been worshipping Ashtaroth and Asmodeus, indulging in all sorts of nastiness, and plotting all kinds of wickedness. It is not necessary to believe such scandals, or to think that the king believed them, to explain her downfall. We need not place faith in black masses or diabolical conjurations, in order to account for the fact that Louis XIV. discarded Madame de Montespan and clove to Madame de Maintenon. The explanation can be based upon one of the most familiar facts in human experience, that a man grows tired of one woman and becomes enamored of another. Nothing is more common; it required no secret crimes on the part of the abandoned favorite to explain the desertion; it rested not on woman's wickedness, but on man's fickleness. But probably most persons who like to read of royal mistresses and royal scandals want their literary viands highly spiced. The offenses of which Mr. Williams accuses Madame de Montespan are bad enough and mysterious enough to suit the strongest taste for hidden and horrid crime. After all, if the readers of his book think Madame de Montespan somewhat worse than she was, no great harm is done. She was, at any rate, bad enough. JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

The Valet's Tragedy and other Studies. By ANDREW LANG. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xiv, 366.)

Of these twelve studies three are purely literary, two dealing with the ballads of Lord Bateman and of the Queen's Marie, and the third being an essay on the Bacon-Shakespeare imbroglio. This last is a delightful bit of acute, lucid, and witty criticism; and if the Baconians were but blessed with a shred of humor, Mr. Lang would certainly bring them to reason. Of the remaining essays those which deal with the ghosts of Fisher and Lord Lyttelton possess no historical interest. The "Mystery of James de la Cloche" is of a different character, since James was a supposititious son of Charles II., and since the evidence in support of his paternity establishes the further and much more important fact that Charles was anxious to declare himself a Roman Catholic as early as September, 1665.

The Man in the Iron Mask could not, of course, be omitted from such a collection as this. The Mask was only a valet, according to Mr. Lang. M. Funck-Brentano thought he was an Italian diplomat, and there can be little doubt that he was either one or the other. The general consensus of opinion has been in favor of Funck-Brentano's contention, that the Mask was Mattioli, a Mantuan diplomat. Mr. Lang's arguments are, however, convincing as against Mattioli. The long imprisonment of the valet, Mr. Lang is inclined to think, was the result of "the red tape" of the old régime, a conclusion which recalls Paine's retort to

Burke in the *Rights of Man*: "Mr. Burke might have been in the Bastille his whole life, as well under Louis XVI as Louis XV, and neither the one nor the other have known that such a man as Mr. Burke existed." This was undoubtedly true of the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., but hardly of that of Louis XIV. Moreover, the quotations from the correspondence of the king and his ministers show clearly enough that they were well aware of the presence of the prisoner and also of his importance. Red tape is an inadequate explanation.

The story of the valet's master reveals Louis XIV.'s brutal disregard of the legal rights of nations and of private individuals. The cruel murder of Roux de Marsilly was less justifiable than that of the Duc d'Enghien and infinitely more horrible and inhumane. The act is a parallel to the illegal butchery of Patkul by Charles XII.

The voices of Jeanne d'Arc and the story of the false Jeanne furnish Mr. Lang with two more mysteries. It hardly seems reasonable to be surprised because people in 1450 believed that Jeanne had not been executed or because her brothers and the city government of Orleans recognized the Pretender as the Maid. We should have to know all the motives which these people had for recognition before deciding on the question, and these never can be known. As to the lack of belief in Jeanne's death, that is what was to be expected. To convince oneself of this, one has only to recall the avidity with which semi-intelligent people in our own day believe that the Dauphin escaped from the Temple and lived laborious days in the wild west of America; or that Marshal Ney never was shot, but quietly retired on half-pay.

In the essay on Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, Mr. Lang attacks the theory recently advanced by Pollock to the effect that Godfrey was murdered "by 'the Queen's confessor', Le Fevre, 'a Jesuit', and some other Jesuits, with lay assistance". Mr. Pollock reached this result by a process of exclusion, but it is evident that the process of exclusion will not avail here, because no one knows all the elements in the case, and after excluding all the known possibilities, a score of unknown ones may remain. In any case, Mr. Lang shows beyond a doubt that Pollock has reached his conclusion on insufficient evidence. There is no reason for supposing that Le Fevre was the queen's confessor, or that there was a Jesuit by that name; it is absurd to swallow the lies of Prance and Bedloe, and impossible to pick out the truth in these lies; the theory of murder by the Jesuits cannot be established by such evidence. But having confuted Mr. Pollock, Mr. Lang has no explanation of his own. He leans toward the hypothesis of suicide, though he thinks the evidence of the surgeons conclusive against this. This certainly does not follow. Surgeons occasionally err, and most grossly. If the surgeons' evidence were all that stood in the way, one should have no difficulty in accepting the hypothesis of suicide, but there are countless other objections. So there are to any other hypothesis.

In the essay on Amy Robsart all that we yet know concerning the affair is contained. Elizabeth, so far as the evidence now accessible

goes, is cleared of foreknowledge of Amy's death; the improbability that any murder was committed is shown; and it is evident that if there were a murder, the Earl of Leicester was not privy to it. There remain two inexplicable facts: Elizabeth herself spoke of "an attempt" in regard to Amy; and no one knows how the unfortunate woman came to her death. So much is clear. For the rest Mr. Lang's reasoning is at times too tenuous, and particularly so in regard to a remark made by Cecil to the Spanish ambassador to the effect that "they were thinking of destroying Lord Robert's wife" and that she "was taking care not to be poisoned". Mr. Lang presumes that Cecil said this because he was told something of the sort by a Doctor Bayly. That Bayly knew anything is not certain. He was asked to prescribe for Amy Robsart, says an anonymous libel published twenty years later, and immediately inferred that his patient was to be poisoned. This is all, even if we credit the libel. Mr. Lang credits it, because Bayly didn't deny it. But there might be a score of reasons for not denying an assertion made concerning an event which had occurred twenty years earlier, and an assertion which imputed no guilt to Bayly. In any case, Bayly's not denying the libel does not, as Mr. Lang infers, establish its truth. But having proceeded thus far on the basis of an anonymous libel and of Froude's version of a Spanish despatch, Mr. Lang next guesses that Bayly "blabbed" to Cecil, for if not, how did Cecil happen to speak to the Spanish ambassador at this time about Amy's taking care not to be poisoned. Since such an idea was common property throughout the country-side, one might guess that Cecil picked it up without Bayly's assistance. Again, Lang's interpretation of the phrase "as all men said" (he quotes it later and incorrectly "as all men suppose") is probably mistaken. What "all men said" was that Amy was found murdered, not that the coroner's inquest had so declared. Nor is Lang justified in arguing, because Appleyard declared that the jury "had not yet given up their verdict", that such was the fact. The evidence leads one to believe that Appleyard was called to account for saying this when he knew the fact to be otherwise.

As always Mr. Lang writes easily and pleasantly, though in a loose and rather slovenly style; he is not always accurate, and occasionally, as noted above, gives two versions for the same short sentence; he is tiresomely repetitious, and cannot get through an essay without solemnly asserting of some one that "his doom was dight"; and he uses scraps of French when English would convey the meaning quite as forcibly.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

The Jesuits in Great Britain: an Historical Inquiry into their Political Influence. By WALTER WALSH, F. R. Hist. S. (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1903. Pp. xiii, 358.)

As one might expect from Mr. Walsh's interests and activities and from the character of his previous writings, the present work is decidedly

bellicose in tone. The author believes that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Jesuits were "the ringleaders in sedition and rebellion", that "If they could have had their way Protestantism would have been exterminated, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, not by fair controversial methods, but by crooked dealing, and, above all, by foreign soldiers." He declares that the British Empire is the chief center of Jesuit operations at the present moment and that "Every lover of Protestantism should realise more clearly than ever that the Jesuit Order is the great foe of our civil and religious liberty".

More than half the book is devoted to the reign of Queen Elizabeth; then two short chapters are allotted to two episodes in the reign of her successor, James I., the Gunpowder Plot and the conversion of Anne of Denmark. While the writer throws some new light on the latter point, he tends to overestimate Anne's importance as a factor in ecclesiastical politics. From here a long stride brings us to the period of the second Charles. The death of Charles marks the end of anything like a consecutive narrative. The extremely readable sketch that follows of Ignatius Loyola and the foundation of the Jesuit order, professedly based on the works of Bonhours, Genelli, and Stewart Rose, might better have been used for an introductory chapter. The concluding pages describe the constitution of the Society of Jesus and present some interesting though fragmentary and miscellaneous information concerning its general influence through affiliated sodalities and congregations. The uneven proportions of the treatment are doubtless conditioned somewhat by the material available, and possibly by the author's opinion of the relative importance of the topics selected. Nevertheless, the history of the activity of the Jesuits in England in the last two centuries is practically untilled ground, and should have appealed more to Mr. Walsh's rather present-day interests.

As a contribution to the history of the subject, the book, in spite of its febrile temper, is of value. The author's acquaintance with the writings of the Jesuits, past and present, is remarkably wide; he has likewise utilized the calendars of state papers and other original sources to good purpose. For the part of the field into which he goes most fully, namely, the plots of the Elizabethan period, his work well supplements the recent contributions of Father Taunton and Major Hume. He is careful in his references, and cites liberally from rare and not easily accessible sources, printing in full, for example, three letters (pp. 254-262) from Charles II., relating to that obscure person, James de la Cloche, his eldest son.

Apparently Mr. Walsh's manifest prejudices do not lead him to violate historic caution in gaging the value of material. He points out that the evidence for many of the later attempts to murder Queen Elizabeth comes from doubtful sources, and although he did not have the advantage of using Mr. Pollock's exhaustive study, *The Popish Plot*, his general conclusions are in substantial agreement with those generally accepted by English historians. Nevertheless, his reasoning from the facts, in some particular instances, is open to question, as in the case of

the alleged murder of Somerville in prison (p. 91), and the likelihood of Phelippes's interpolations of Babington's letter (pp. 120-121). Moreover, he certainly exaggerates the share of the Jesuits in sending the Armada (p. 139) and in the dismissal of Clarendon (p. 250), while any careful student of James I. and Charles II. would reject his hasty and sweeping characterizations of those monarchs (pp. 128, 185, 186, 218) as contrary to fact. Such head-lines as "Whitewashing Assassination" (p. 67), "Assassination 'by Poison or by Steel'" (p. 115), "Piety, Blood, and Murder" (p. 119) suggest sensational journalism, and will cause, not only scholars, but average readers to wag their heads. One wonders what is meant by "'Venerable' Saint" (p. 173), and whether beatification necessarily involves ultimate canonization (p. 199). Also it is somewhat of a shock to see Parkman called "the Canadian historian" (p. 329). One regrets to see a book not without historical merit disfigured by acrid displays of feeling, and queries whether the author would not have better served his purpose by letting the facts speak for themselves, and by omitting to lug in modern applications by the ears.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Parliamentary England: the Evolution of the Cabinet System. By

EDWARD JENKS, M.A., Reader in English Law in the University of Oxford. [Story of the Nations Series.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. xix, 441.)

IN this book Mr. Jenks has given us a history of all important parliamentary proceedings since the Restoration, together with such other portions of the history of England as are necessary to an understanding of these Parliamentary transactions. The first title is perhaps more appropriate than the second, for while the evolution of the cabinet system is carefully traced, quite as many pages are devoted to the legislation and administration of the past two centuries as to the development of the machinery of legislation and administration. Indeed, the most important criticism that can be made upon the book is that while the development of the cabinet system is prominent, there are, considering the subtitle, so many diversions that it is at times difficult to keep the thread of the narrative. This fault is in part remedied in the last chapter, which contains an admirable summary of the process of evolution. While there is nothing new in this work, a large number of facts in constitutional and political history are presented in orderly fashion, and the result is most readable.

Mr. Jenks considers (pp. 92-93) that the only absolutely essential features of the cabinet system are (1) that the cabinet should be composed mainly, if not wholly, of the actual occupants of great political offices; (2) that the supreme control of the national administration should be in the hands of the cabinet. Other features, such as the solidarity of the cabinet, its ability to command a majority in the House

of Commons, and the absence of the sovereign from its meetings, he regards as important but not essential. It is of course possible to conceive of a system of cabinet government in which these features should be lacking, but it would not be the English cabinet system, nor is it easy to see how such a government could solve the problem of combining popularity with efficiency. Like other writers Mr. Jenks rejects Macaulay's theory that the cabinet system was adopted between 1692 and 1695, when the famous Whig Junto came into power. If an exact date must be fixed for the beginning of the new order, he thinks that the year 1705, when the Tory Marlborough-Godolphin ministry was transformed into the Whig Marlborough-Godolphin ministry, has stronger claims than any date which precedes it. But almost as strong an argument can be made against 1705 as against 1692-1695. Both marked stages in the development — that is all. Yet although Mr. Jenks would put the beginnings of cabinet government later than some authorities have done, even in the Cabal Ministry of Charles II. he sees one feature of the coming system which historians generally have failed to recognize. "In dismissing Clarendon and admitting the Cabal to office," he tells us, "he [Charles] was really losing a servant and gaining a master. . . . however divided amongst themselves, however innocent of principle, the new Ministers resembled a modern Cabinet in this important fact — that they hoped to govern England according to their own views, and not according to the views of the King" (p. 24).

The really valuable chapter is the last one, entitled "History and Criticism". Here the results of the introduction of the cabinet system are summed up as (1) the increase in the popularity and prestige of the crown; (2) the unity which has been given to political organs; (3) the spirit of leniency which has come over British politics in the last century and a half; (4) the fact that the government of England has become a government by persuasion. Attention has been called to these points before, but the reviewer does not remember having seen before so adequate an exposition of the effect of the increased popularity of the crown, as resulting from the cabinet system, upon the unity of the empire. "For", Mr. Jenks says, "if it is a good thing that the Crown should be popular in Great Britain, it is absolutely essential, if the unity of the Empire is to be preserved, that the Crown should be popular in the Greater Britain beyond the seas. . . . There is but one King in all the British Empire; there are many Parliaments. . . . So far as institutions are a bond, it is, in fact, the popularity of the Crown, and not the popularity of the British Parliament, which holds the Empire together; and it is the legal position of the Crown, as the supreme organ of political activity, which enables the Empire to speak with a single voice" (pp. 403-405).

Mr. Jenks points out that inasmuch as the cabinet system is a system of government by persuasion, "The man of great force of character, tenaciously bent on carrying out a distant object of supreme importance, finds no ostensible place in it" (p. 423); that there is no room in the cabinet for a Bismarck or a Cavour. Whether this is a defect or not he

does not discuss at length, but he calls attention to the fact that whereas under the old system the minister had both to find out the ideas and to apply them, under the present arrangement he is more and more the mere exponent and enforcer of ideas furnished to him from without. Therefore the English Bismarcks and Cavours may do more effective work outside the cabinet than in it.

Exception may perhaps be taken to the statement on page 408 that "never, since the days of George I., has there been a quarrel between Parliament and the Crown, save for the few brief months at the beginning of 1784". In 1757 the country was for three months without a government because George II. was unwilling to accept the ministers whom Parliament finally succeeded in forcing upon him.

MARY TAYLOR BLAUVELT.

The Unreformed House of Commons: Parliamentary Representation before 1832. By EDWARD PORRITT, assisted by ANNIE G. PORRITT. Vol. I., England and Wales; Vol. II., Scotland and Ireland. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxi, 623; xiv, 584.)

THE title of these two large volumes, containing about half a million words, is too modest. The book is really an elaborate history of the representation of the Commons in the three kingdoms, including not merely the character of the various franchises, but the whole scheme of the relations between members of Parliament and their constituents. Constitutional histories dealing with the legal aspects of such questions we have in abundance; social and political histories are also sufficiently numerous, but nowhere else is there to be found in one work so full an account of the membership of the House of Commons, associated with adequate glimpses of social environment. On the constitutional side Mr. Porritt's work will take its place beside Stubbs and May, and on the social with Lecky in regard to England and Ireland, and with Burton in regard to Scotland. These volumes are only part of what he promises. He intends to complete the work with a history of Parliamentary reform from the time of Elizabeth to the Redistribution Bill of 1885.

Mr. Porritt is an Englishman who has carried on the chief portion of his studies in the United States and in Canada. He bears testimony to the adequacy of cisatlantic libraries for such studies, and by residence under different types of representative institutions he has cultivated a certain detachment of mind, which is however not yet complete. Stubbs boasted that no one could tell from his writings whether he was a Radical or a Tory. Mr. Porritt champions democracy. There is no evidence of profound learning in regard to the earlier history of representative institutions. His attention is fixed chiefly on the last three centuries, but in regard to these his work is very thorough, and, among other things, he appears to have gone through the whole of the eighty-odd volumes of the *House of Commons Journals*. In addition to the standard authorities

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. IX.—37.

he has used a great many memoirs throwing light on the relations between a member and his patron on the one hand, or his constituents on the other. He acknowledges the constant assistance of his wife, "without whom indeed the work would not have been undertaken". Excellent maps showing the representation in each of the three kingdoms add to the value of the work.

Mr. Porritt deals first with Parliamentary representation in England and Wales. Nowhere else is there to be found so lucid an account of the county and borough franchises, and one is tempted to turn aside to note the many singular characteristics and anomalies of these franchises, but space does not permit. In 1696 an act was passed practically prohibiting changes in the English constituencies. In 1729 any doubts on the finality of this measure were removed through the action of the House of Lords, a body which really had little right to pronounce upon representation in the Commons, and from that time boroughs were looked upon as private property. Then to alter the representation of a borough was to interfere with the vested rights, for which the English system has always showed special solicitude. The voter as well as the borough-owner had vested rights. In a small borough to have a vote was to be set up for life, and Mr. Porritt notes that the approach of an election sometimes sufficed to bring a hesitating swain to the point, since "the bribes to freemen were often sufficiently large to pay for the furnishing of a house" (I. 79).

After discussing the basis of representation, Mr. Porritt enters elaborately into the relations between members and constituents. He traces out the gradual removal of the restrictions on the choice of members until at last in 1832 only Jews and atheists were excluded from the House of Commons. Not, however, till 1891 did a Scottish constituency elect a Roman Catholic. The successive steps by which men without means were excluded from the House furnish a long and interesting chapter. It is in this respect that England is still far from the democratic level of the United States or Canada, for though the property qualification has been abolished, candidates must still pay the official election expenses. This is even now a heavy burden and in times past it was enormous. The fee of a returning officer was sometimes as much as £200, and where, as happened occasionally, the poll was kept open for six weeks, the unhappy candidates paid all the expenses of a small army of officials for that prolonged period. The following interesting case is cited:

"An example of what unscrupulous opponents might do is forthcoming in an episode in the election for the city of Norwich in 1818, when Edward Harbord, afterwards Baron Suffield, was contesting Norwich against William Smith and R. H. Gurney. At the close of the first day's poll, Harbord was left so far behind Gurney that all hope of carrying his election was abandoned. "Under these circumstances", writes Harbord's biographer, "one of the leaders of the party announced to him, that it was still desirable to keep the poll open. Mr Harbord inquired on what grounds. 'It will put Mr Gurney to a charge of one thousand pounds', was the reply. Tears of indignation actually arose in

his eyes, and he exclaimed, 'Good God, sir! What can you have seen in my conduct to lead you to infer that I would consent to put an honourable adversary, or any adversary, to such an expense for the mere purpose of aggrrieving him?' (I. 191).

Mr. Porritt gives a history of the exclusion of office-holders from the House, and in a discussion of the ties between electors and elected he shows how slowly was developed the custom of granting the Chiltern Hundreds as a matter of course, so that a member might at will retire from the House of Commons. But to this day no provision has been made by which a constituency can get rid of an unwelcome member. The interesting account of the relations between members and constituents brings out the point that the unreformed House of Commons of the eighteenth century was in fact keenly sensitive to public opinion, and a certain reproach attached to the members for rotten boroughs, who were commonly under rigorous orders from their patrons. The intervention of George III. in elections shows with what keenness he followed the fortunes of each seat. He used his personal influence even with his tradesmen at Windsor, and he is found writing about vacancies within an hour or two of their occurrence.

In the first half of the second volume we are in a totally different atmosphere, for we pass to Scotland, which owed little in its representative institutions to the influence of England. Here Mr. Porritt follows the same method, but the Scottish Parliament disappeared two hundred years ago, and its history is therefore shorter. It had some peculiarities. There were three estates—the nobles, the shire members, and the borough members—but they all sat in one chamber; they had not a speaker, but a president, and the elected members were called commissioners. We are reminded that small bodies may do better work than large ones when we see that the Scottish Parliament, though never really representative, enacted legislation in regard, for instance, to education and land tenure far in advance of anything done in England. But the Union proved a blight to such progress. Then the borough-mongers—of whom the chief was Pitt's friend Dundas—completely controlled the Scottish members. In all the counties there were, prior to 1832, less than three thousand voters, and in all the boroughs only about thirteen hundred. Dundas knew nearly every voter in Scotland, where the wild scenes of an English election were not repeated, for the voters, being of the superior class, expected to be called upon decorously by the candidate both before and after an election. To this day, the electors to a few publicly endowed posts in Scotland, such as some of the professorships in the universities, expect to be called upon by all the candidates.

Unlike the Scottish, Irish representative institutions were modeled upon those of England, and to them Mr. Porritt devotes more than half of his second volume. There is a very full history of the struggle for the extension of the franchise to Roman Catholics. Mr. Porritt comments upon the magnificence of the Irish Parliament House and upon the almost oriental pomp of the lord lieutenant, who went out to dinner

attended by a squadron of horse, and in a chariot surrounded by men with battle-axes. Though the Irish Parliament copied that of England, it developed differences. Its House of Peers was insignificant. Long before any comforts appeared at Westminster, the Irish Parliament was a luxurious club, and most of the members of the Commons lived permanently in Dublin and were readily at the call of the government. In contrast with the rigorous exclusion practised in England, the public were allowed in crowds to attend the debates in the Irish Commons. Mr. Porritt does not find much in favor of "Grattan's Parliament"; indeed he departs a little from the reserve of the historian to say that Ireland has little cause to regret the loss of a Parliament so defectively constituted as hers was. It is the only child of the Mother of Parliaments that has ceased to exist.

So extensive a work is unlikely to be free from small defects. There is a good deal of repetition, and Mr. Porritt in his desire to illustrate the past by the present makes some assumptions hardly justified. It is doubtful, for instance, whether personal bribery has wholly disappeared from English elections (I. 164); if the gossip of the House of Commons is credible, elections are still won by buying votes, and there is a paradoxical conviction that the electors in the cathedral cities are the most corrupt. It is hard also to justify the assertion (I. 278) that in 1893 a majority was secured in the House of Commons for Mr. Gladstone's Home-Rule Bill, only because it was certain that the Lords would reject the measure. Mr. Porritt is too doctrinaire. Because of the obvious defects of the unreformed system he condemns it without reserve, and yet through it statesmen like Peel and Gladstone gained admission to public life. Westminster with its slum district is not entirely a city of "magnificent streets" (I. 567). Blount (I. 501) should be Blunt, and Roland (I. 290) was not the name of Rowland Hill. Scotsmen do not like in written discourse the term Scotch for Scottish; and country-house is better than "country homes" when buildings are indicated (I. 472). But these are trifles. Though the style is without distinction, it is clear. There are separate indexes for England, Scotland, and Ireland, and copious lists of authorities.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Charles James Fox: a Political Study. By J. L. LE B. HAMMOND.
(London: Methuen and Company; New York: James Pott and Company. 1903. Pp. xi, 370.)

It would seem a brave man who in the face of Trevelyan's *Early History of Charles James Fox* and his *American Revolution* ventured to challenge comparison with those fascinating books by another volume on the same subject. Yet, aside from the fact that even such brilliant work as that of Trevelyan might, in our opinion, still leave a field for a more impartial biography of Fox, there is another reason for the appearance of Mr. Hammond's book. Save in very small measure, he deals only with that part of the life of Fox which Trevelyan's books have not yet

reached, and he would be the first, as he says in his preface, to deny that his book could in any way take the place of the work of him who has so largely inspired this present study. The present work, as he further declares, "is in no sense a biography". It is, as the chapter-scheme shows, rather a series of essays on the various phases of Fox's public career, grouped about those questions which seemed to dominate each phase or period. This plan gives to the book somewhat more of a logical than chronological continuity, but without wholly neglecting the latter, and it has the additional advantage of enabling the author to pursue his main purpose, a thoroughgoing defense of Fox, his public acts and policy, more coherently than could have been the case under almost any other arrangement. The first chapter, Preliminary, covers briefly that period elaborated in Trevelyan's *Early History*. The succeeding chapters take up in turn Fox and the king, Parliamentary reform, the Reign of Terror, Fox and Ireland, colonies and dependencies, in which is gathered his policy toward both America and India, Fox and the French Revolution, Fox's policy in 1792, Fox and nationalism, Fox and the French war, and religious toleration. The tone of the book shows unqualified admiration for its hero and breathes the spirit of militant liberalism. It is evident that, consciously or unconsciously, Mr. Hammond belongs to that group of literary Liberals who from Burke to Morley have voiced the doctrines of that political faith. But unlike the two on whom we have no doubt much relied in our estimate of this period, he sees no good in Pitt. Lord Macaulay and Lord Rosebery have given us estimates of that statesman which, differing as they do, seem none the less to draw together in the light of the present attack. In this respect Mr. Hammond's book at least gives us much to think about, and if we cannot always agree with his contentions, we are at least grateful for a new point of view and for arguments which, though old as the rivalry of the two great leaders, are here stated with freshness, clearness, and force. We are, indeed, grateful for more than this. The life of Fox has been singularly neglected, whether we consider his place in the politics of the time or in the general history of Liberalism. He was in a considerable part of his career the champion of lost causes, and of what seemed at times, in the clash of war, almost forgotten beliefs.

Though the times were against him and circumstances made, or seemed to make, many of his proposals impossible, the circumstances of his early life and his somewhat idealistic temperament, better fitted for intellectual conflict than for leadership, together with the antagonism of the king, and a certain general disbelief in his sincerity, seldom brought him into the conduct of affairs, or long maintained him there, he yet seems worthy of more attention than he has thus far received. To discuss in detail the work under consideration would be to rewrite the history of England for thirty years. But in general one may be permitted to say that, despite the author's vigor and conviction, it may perhaps be doubted whether, even if Fox were so uniformly right and Pitt well-nigh invariably wrong in the light of the long resolution of policies and events,

that is wholly the standard by which each should be judged, whether, in other words, the circumstances of the times and the responsibilities of office should not also be considered. Mr. Hammond does not merely adopt Macaulay's dictum that Pitt was feeble as a war minister, but he arraigns his good faith as a reformer as well, and his casual mention of Lord Rosebery may indicate at least one animus of the book. His views are indeed not all equally new nor all equally sound, but they are clearly presented and ably defended. His style has force and enthusiasm. Seeking to develop, from facts already largely known, theses not wholly new, he yet brings to the discussion an amount of information, argument, and illustration that makes the book a distinct contribution to the subject and to the period. This very force and enthusiasm do, indeed, lead at times to a certain floridity of phrase not wholly conducive to the exact apportionment of truth, nor, perhaps, adding much to the closeness of argument. It is picturesque to say of the colonists that they "lived in a moral atmosphere that was arctic to all the elegant fopperies of long-established social hierarchies, and their minds moved within the horizons of a sombre and morose religion", but one may be permitted to wonder how many would recognize this as a correct view of the complex human conditions of the American people before the Revolution. It may seem to some minds a fine phrase, as no doubt it is, to say that Fox "faced in the second great crisis of his life, bereft now of his stoutest comrades, the myriad phantoms of menace, and brooding hate, and unforgiving fury, in which the darkness of the hour avenges itself on those who dare to see beyond it". But it would seem that the greatness of the subject might well have sufficed without even a fine phrase. One lingers over the matter of style because it is so evident, and, despite these frequent passages of fine writing, a very great part of the undoubted charm of this work. It is an eminently readable narrative argument, not pretending to be the result of the laborious research of the scholar, or to contain masses of new material and impartial statements. Its bibliography smacks more of Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors* and Lecky's works, of Morley and Rosebery, and such secondary authorities, than of manuscripts and archives and unpublished documents. Yet in the body of the book it has to do with such material and cannot be considered unscholarly. And it is, very decidedly, whether one agrees with it or not, a book to be read for the pleasure and information it gives, and in any estimate of the life or period it covers, a book to be reckoned with for the ability and force with which its theses are presented and defended.

Geographic Influences in American History. By ALBERT PERRY BRIGHAM, A.M., F.G.S.A., Professor in Colgate University. (Boston: Ginn and Company. 1903. Pp. xiv, 366.)

American History and its Geographic Conditions. By ELLEN CHURCHILL SEMPLE. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1903. Pp. iv, 466.)

THOUGH geography is well known to be the handmaid of history, their relations are too little noticed by experts in either subject. A few books, notably Hinsdale's *How to Study and Teach History*, have sought to connect the face of the country with the course of its history; but the two books upon this subject which lie upon our table are welcome additions. Professor Brigham writes from the point of view of the geologist, but of the geologist who concerns himself not simply with the face of the country and the manner in which it has been carved out, nor with the geological materials and minerals useful to man which are under the earth. He treats topography as a basis of production; hence he discusses climates, soils, and crops. His very chapter-titles suggest that he looks upon the face of the country as a region habitable by man and interesting because of that human occupancy: "Shore-line and Hilltop in New England", "Cotton, Rice, and Cane", "Where Little Rain Falls". His method is to sweep over the country from east to west, describing the salient features, and then showing how far they have affected the course of settlement, of the growth of population, and of military movement. For instance, after describing the Hudson and Mohawk valleys and their geographical history, he tells of the Iroquois and their position athwart the natural highway from east to west; of the coming of the Dutch and the English; of the Dutch, German, and English place-names; of the importance of the Hudson valley in the Revolution as an avenue for British armies and as a bridge from New England to the middle states. Then he describes the opening up of the Erie Canal and the New York Central and West Shore railroads in recent times.

Throughout this vigorous and suggestive book we find such interesting combinations of what is and what has been that one's circle of knowledge is easily and simply enlarged. The book is attractively illustrated with typical bits of scenery, mountains, cliffs, rocky sea-coast, rivers, lakes, forests, harbors, towns, and cities. The live-oak, the river steamer, the orange orchard, and the snow-shed supplement the mountain trail; the desert and the cañon illustrate the larger American geography. Serviceable maps, several of them in relief, bring clearly to the mind the topographic basis of the whole. To be sure, Professor Brigham makes history rather the handmaid of geography; yet the book is a study of the effect of environment upon national character and development, and as such deserves to be read and pondered by the economist and sociologist as well as by the historian.

Miss Semple's book is larger, more ambitious, and more distinctly historical. Beginning with the geography of western Europe, she takes up the effect of the North American rivers, then of the Appalachian barrier, then of the interior, and so extends her geographic description according to the historical advance of the frontier, rather than by a pre-determined geological system. She has seized upon the idea set forth in Thwaites's books, that a key to early American exploration and settlement is to be found in the portages; and by useful sketch-maps and description she brings out the importance of various passes and navigable streams. For instance, she makes clear once for all why it was that Kentucky was settled by a trail leading across the head waters of the Tennessee. She has constantly in mind not so much the face of the country as the movement of people across it, a movement directed by the natural features and often circumscribed by them.

A large part of the book is a study of the arrival and distribution of foreign elements and the determinants of urban and rural settlement. To a much larger degree than Professor Brigham, Miss Semple concerns herself with the human element, with man upon the land, with artificial highways, roads, canals, and railroads. It is a book extremely useful to those who have been in the habit of thinking of their country in the flat, of seeing on the map only artificial subdivisions which you cross over as you travel, without being aware of them. She takes America as a part of the earth surface, connected rather than divided by great oceans, with lands to the eastward and to the westward. For that understanding of the history of the western United States which has become essential the book is especially valuable. A fair example of her conception is the term "American Mediterranean", which she applies to the Gulf of Mexico, or the chapter on "The United States as a Pacific Ocean Power". A task so ambitious requires for success a greater grasp both of conditions and of historic development than any one person can be expected to possess.

To compare the two books, Professor Brigham's is the work of an expert scientific man who loves the face of his country and who wants his countrymen to see how much it affects national life. Miss Semple's book is much less precise and authoritative, but it brings together for the service of the student and the general reader a wealth of material hitherto unclassified and often unavailable, upon the function of man in overcoming the obstacles which nature set to the occupation of this continent.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

Historic Highways of America. By ARCHER BUTLER HULBERT. Vol. VII., Portage Paths: the Keys of the Continent; Vol. IX., Waterways of Westward Expansion: the Ohio River and its Tributaries. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1903. Pp. 194; 220.)

Few will question that portage paths are of sufficient importance as connecting links in American highways to deserve a special volume in

this rapidly appearing series. Whatever study of portages has been made heretofore is simply incidental to some history or confined to a single portage. The author has here an opportunity of making deductions from a general survey of the field. Some of his conclusions are that the portages were famous meeting or parting places; that they became consequently camping places; that they often differed materially in ascending or descending a stream; that they usually traversed a great watershed system; that they were used as burying-grounds by the Indians and as sites for altars by the Jesuits; and that boat-building and kindred industries were frequently carried on at the ends of portages. Stone ovens may still be found at the termini of these paths, where food was prepared and packed for the journey. Portages were also used by the white men as convenient points for making conventions and treaties with the Indians.

The plan of treatment, which first considers the nature and evolution of portages generally and next gives a catalogue of the principal ones, necessarily involves duplication. That is to say, the material for each portion must be taken from the same source. Perhaps the omission of the Wills Creek portage from the list may be due to the fact that it occupies a large part of two other volumes of the series. Yet the omission is in keeping with the evident purpose to confine the study exclusively to those portages crossing the watersheds immediately south of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. These carrying places were unquestionably the most important, were the earliest used, and furnished the most accessible material because of the Jesuit writings. Perhaps an extended study might have disclosed many other portages of importance, such as that from the head of the James or Staunton to the Cheat or New rivers, or to the head waters of the Tennessee river; from the Tennessee to the Cumberland; or to and from the streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico. Did not the pioneers who adventured from the Yadkin to the Watauga make or use portage paths which might have been included in a comprehensive study? Were there not portage paths from the Red and Arkansas rivers toward the Spanish posts in the southwest? Such questions are raised for the sake not of faultfinding but of suggestion.

The importance of portages in the struggle between the French and English, who occupied respective sides of the northern watersheds, is well brought out in this volume. The location of forts and blockhouses as well as the direction of movements of campaigns attest the value placed on these strategic points of communication. The style in which these facts are brought out is vivid; but it is doubtful whether an actual count would warrant the statement in connection with the English advance into the interior that "ten score of portage paths had been traversed". The treachery of local geography is manifest in several instances, notably where the Chicago portage is given water termini in the Illinois and Des Plaines rivers, instead of the Des Plaines and Chicago rivers. The "little lake" of Marquette and La Salle lies between the latter streams. The Des Plaines empties into the Illinois many miles below the portage.

Another instance is to be found in making Elgin, Illinois, the terminus of the Chicago Drainage Canal, a consummation most devoutly to be wished by the citizens of Joliet.

Common consent will probably say that Volume IX., devoted to the Ohio river as a waterway, is the most acceptable of the series thus far, estimating it by the facts that it brings out, the diversity of authorities consulted, and the elimination of extraneous matter. The subject presents some advantages in being defined, in covering a long period of time in American history, and in offering a variety of evidence much larger in quantity than some topics previously covered. Céloron's *Journal* is used to introduce the navigation of the river by white men. The Indian wars which retarded movement on the northern shore are next described. Four well-written chapters follow, on the navigation of the stream from head to mouth, the evolution of the river-craft, the development of different types of river-men, and the improvement of the stream for navigation made by the national government.

In describing the various successive forms of vessels employed on the river, the author calls attention to the rapid change and improvement in water transportation compared with the conservative means of land transportation in the same period. The freighter or Conestoga wagon of 1790, he shows, was practically the same vehicle in 1840, save for a few minor improvements. But within that time, the canoe, pirogue, keel-boat, bark, barge, brig, schooner, galley-boat, bateau, and dugout had each played its part in the river and been forgotten in the application of steam to vessels. Waterways were developed before great highways, and the use of steam followed the same order.

For the chapter on the actual river journey from Pittsburg to New Orleans, the author has called into service an edition of that useful but forgotten book, Cramer's *Navigators*. He reproduces extracts, with comments and explanations, forming a kind of panoramic survey of the experiences of the voyage as known to our western forebears. Timothy Flint is also drawn upon for his personal experience.

Readers who wish the picturesque element will find it in this part of the book. Those who prefer the more scholarly will be accommodated in the last chapter, descriptive of the public improvements on the stream. As early as 1804 a company was chartered in Kentucky to build a canal around the troublesome Falls of the Ohio at Louisville. In 1825 a new company was encouraged by a subscription to nearly two-thirds its stock by the United States government. In 1874 it passed completely into the hands of the national government, having cost \$4,577,880.09, over half of which was borne by the new owner. Appropriations for the improvement of the river proper did not begin until 1827, although urged much earlier. Until the year 1902 a total of \$6,565,608.12 had been given for this purpose. This is over \$100,000 less than was expended on the Cumberland National Road. Engineers' reports show that ten thousand obstructions in the nature of sunken logs, stumps, etc., were removed from the stream; also that at one time in

the length of the river there were no less than twenty-eight wrecks and seventy-two sunken boats to be taken from the channels. This is a commentary both on the need of internal improvements and on the hazards of river transportation in 1866.

Maps of the Ohio river by Bonnécamps (1749), by Gordon (1766), and by Rufus Putnam (1804) are reproduced in this volume. Volume VIII., it should be said in explanation, is postponed for the present in bringing out the series.

EDWIN ERLE SPARKS.

Robert Morris, Patriot and Financier. By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER, PH.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd. 1903. Pp. xi, 372.)

MR. OBERHOLTZER has the good fortune to be the first exploiter of the Robert Morris Papers, which were recently purchased for the Library of Congress. These manuscripts have a romantic history; apparently they were accessible to Sparks, then disappeared, were rediscovered by General Meredith Read in a French country town just as they were to be consigned to a paper-mill, and by him jealously guarded and withheld from the student's use. In 1876 Mr. Read confided the papers for a few weeks to Mr. Henry A. Homes, librarian of the New York State Library, and Mr. Homes published a brief memorandum of their contents. He also appended three or four pages of extracts from the correspondence. Later Professor Sumner in the preparation of *The Financier and the Finances of the American Revolution* endeavored to consult the papers, but, "it was not consistent with General Read's views" to grant the request. Upon Read's death the papers were purchased by Congress. Mr. Oberholtzer's description of the manuscript volumes is very brief, irritatingly so, when one considers their novelty and importance. Indeed, so far as the reader can judge, the slight bibliographical notes in the preface are simply transcripts of some of the statements of Homes. Apparently it was not the author's intention to make an academic contribution to American history. Although the material has been generously utilized, with appropriate quotations and dates, it is impossible for the reader to decide how much of the material has been used and what is the nature of that omitted. It seems most unfortunate that historical students cannot enjoy more fully the results of Mr. Oberholtzer's opportunities and experienced training.

As a readable biography, the work is a distinct success; its style is attractive, and there is shown throughout a sense of proportion and literary construction. Morris's command of the English language was far above the average of his time, and consequently his correspondence yields many gems to the skilful biographer. The life is written in a spirit of warm appreciation. Morris appears as a large-hearted American, a generous liver, accustomed to great schemes, desirous of accomplishing results, and consequently impatient of control. The author speaks of "his rarely sanguine temperament, his freedom from vanity, his sure and con-

fidest touch, and the human note in his life" (p. 286). The author considers that Morris's famous resignation letter in January, 1783, was meant to force Congress to accept his views and to make some definite provision for the debt. "While this motive may have meant some duplicity and implied some vanity to those industrious persons who had long planned his undoing, it will be adjudged an entirely patriotic motive in the light of all our information at the present day" (p. 196). The style of living adopted by Morris is justified, even from the standpoint of expediency. "His homes and carriages, his sumptuous hospitality, his sanguine and inflexible temper, which had contributed to breed confidence in his person in the first instance, must be maintained if the public were not to lose their faith." Morris made a "tactical error" in not settling his early accounts as soon as opportunity afforded; in that way he might have discomfited his enemies. He is credited with an important influence in helping Hamilton in his financial plans, especially in the preparation and working out of the funding bill and the tariff notes. The student of Revolutionary military history may be interested in noting that Oberholtzer does not discover anywhere in the diary that Morris took any part in persuading the generals to abandon the idea of an attack upon New York in order to make a sudden descent upon Cornwallis in Virginia. An interesting account is given of the conveyance of the French money from Boston to Philadelphia in 1781, and of more general importance is the description of Morris's opposition to specific supplies and his endeavors to substitute a contract system based upon cash requisitions. On page 161 is a description of Morris's "sensational operations" with foreign bills.

Three of the manuscript volumes which serve as the basis of this biography are private letter-books containing copies of letters written from December, 1794, to March, 1798, the period of Morris's financial embarrassment and his imprisonment as a debtor. The extracts from these letters are full of a melancholy interest; brave humor and pathos are intermingled. On November 22, 1797, while beset by officers at "The Hills", he wrote, "This bad weather is unfortunate, as it prevents anybody but duns coming hither, and as to them, nothing can keep them away"; on December 2, "I have been very busy this morning watching the man that is watching me."

The book is supplied with a good index; there is a bibliography of three pages; and six illustrations, including portraits and views of the several residences of Morris, add to the general attractiveness of the volume.

DAVIS R. DEWEY.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. VII., 1824-1831. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 374.)

The Writings of James Madison. Edited by GAILLARD HUNT. Vol. IV., 1787; The Journal of the Constitutional Convention, II. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xi, 551.)

MR. HAMILTON'S seventh and concluding volume is melancholy reading. Whatever estimate may be placed on Monroe's intellect and capacity, he had, at the time of his retirement, served his country faithfully and in a highly honorable spirit for more than forty years. His conception of public responsibilities had been an exalted one; his ambitions had been lofty, and he had pursued them with an unusually scrupulous conscience and with a keen regard for the rights of others. That his last years should be harassed as they were by poverty and debt may have been no one's fault. That his pecuniary claims against the government, arising from his diplomatic missions, should have been settled in a spirit showing so little generosity toward him may have had its excuses, though it wears a disagreeable look. But that he should have been made almost constantly the victim of contemptible intrigues on the part of the baser sort of politicians, intended to benefit one or another of the presidential candidates at his expense, and that he should have found so few of the more important public men willing to act a manly part in defending him, casts an unhappy light upon the character of American politics at the time when democracy first obtained full swing. Whenever the thoughtful American is overcome with disgust of our parties, it may comfort him to look back to that brief period, grotesquely called the "Era of Good Feeling", when we had none.

It is true that Monroe "doth protest too much". The self-consciousness which had marked his earlier years, and which had been lessened by successful activity in high executive positions, recurred after his retirement; most of the letters in this volume are labored defenses of his political course. He had neither the philosophic temper which made retirement not uncongenial to Jefferson and Madison, nor their intellectual resources. He tries hard to do his duty as a visitor of the University of Virginia, and to get some satisfaction out of it; but is as helpless as the average modern college trustee in the face of intellectual or educational problems. Adams offers him a mission to Latin America, a considerable group offer him support toward a third election as governor of his state; but circumstances oblige him to decline. Even when he is given a place on the ticket for presidential electors, it is as a part of a small party intrigue. His name and Madison's are put on without their consent, and for six weeks, though the committee are their friends and are no farther away than Richmond, the ex-presidents cannot compel them to remove their names (pp. 125, 134, 144, 149-151). Mr. Hamil-

ton, indeed, thinks that Monroe is still ill-treated, alluding in a foot-note to "the petty rancor and partisan bitterness with which the memory and acts of James Monroe are so frequently and unjustifiably assailed by some historical writers"; but it is not apparent that there is any sufficient basis for this.

Among the most interesting of the letters are two (pp. 175, 187), addressed to Calhoun in August, 1828, and January, 1829, in which, out of mature experience, broad patriotism, and a kind heart, he gently but solemnly remonstrates against the South Carolina heresies of that summer. Besides the letters, the volume contains in its earlier pages several messages to Congress, and at the end a deposition denouncing the base insinuations made by John Rhea, and a reprint of Monroe's pamphlet *Memoir*, remarks and documents relating to his claims (Charlottesville, 1828).

Among these documents is a letter to Paine in 1794 and one to Talleyrand in 1803 (pp. 296, 304), which should have found their place in earlier volumes. By the way, there are printed in the appendix to the twentieth volume of the *Congressional Globe* some very interesting and important papers of Monroe relating to the Missouri Compromise, which ought to have been inserted in Volume VI. Pages 94 to 101 of the present volume mention thirty-two letters of 1814 and 1815 which Monroe thinks important toward the explanation of his conduct with reference to the New Orleans campaign. Nearly all are, or lately were, in the archives of the Department of State; Mr. Hamilton has printed only two of them. Outside that repository of Monroe papers he strays no more than in his first volume. The editing, too, remains upon the same level. There are in the whole volume hardly more than a score of editorial foot-notes, though many more were needed. It would take little trouble to learn (p. 114), that no Shay was professor at the University of Virginia, but that the reading must be Key. Of a similar sort, and of a sort often noticed in the review of previous volumes, are: p. 2, "a decisive *offset* in preventing", for *effect*; pp. 19, 20, *one* for *me* thrice, where *one* makes no sense; p. 32, "50° 40'", for the obvious 54° 40'; p. 131, "an *important* examination", for *impartial*. The volume concludes with indexes to the whole series, which seem excellent. It is pleasant to end upon a note of praise; for, though some criticisms have seemed to the reviewer unavoidable, it is impossible to take leave of this handsome and extensive series without a feeling of gratitude to the editor for the large amount of useful historical material with which he has presented us.

Mr. Hunt's fourth volume offers little opportunity for remark. It contains the second half of what he has unfortunately chosen to call the Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. There are almost no notes but Madison's own, found in the manuscript, and William Pierce's characterizations of members. A long note on the suffrage, printed on pp. 121-127, is not in the *Documentary History*. A facsimile of the first page of the Constitution in its engrossment is given. The volume ends with an index to Volumes III. and IV., of good quality, but less elaborate

than that presented in the *Documentary History*. It is accordingly to be presumed that Mr. Hunt intends these two volumes to have a separate existence and circulation from that of the rest of his series. This, as an accurate, legible, and intelligent edition of Madison's notes, they well deserve.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

The Creevey Papers; a Selection from the Correspondence and Diaries of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P. Born 1768; died 1838. Edited by the Right Hon. Sir HERBERT MAXWELL, Bart., M.P., LL.D., F.R.S. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: John Murray. 1903. Two vols., pp. xxiv, 342; x, 372.)

STUDENTS of English political history of the period extending from the French Revolution to the accession of Queen Victoria have good reason to congratulate themselves on the remarkable find which has been made by Sir Herbert Maxwell. They would be still more in Sir Herbert Maxwell's debt had he edited the Creevey letters, reminiscences, and journals with the care which their historical value and interest demand. The editing, however, has been done with scant claim to consistency and with little of the extreme care that marks the editing by the late Mr. L. J. Jennings of the *Croker Papers*, with which as regards historical value the *Creevey Papers* have been frequently compared. The period covered by the two sets of papers is practically the same. Both Croker and Creevey wrote much of George IV. and William IV. and of the Duke of Wellington. Both dealt with the downfall of the old Toryism, and the end of the unreformed House of Commons, and with the internal condition of the two great political parties in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Croker, however, with all his shortcomings, was a statesman as compared with Creevey; and he stood for something in the House of Commons. Creevey was also long of the House of Commons. He wrote a pamphlet in favor of parliamentary reform, and grouped himself with Radicals such as Whitbread, Romilly, and Hume. But he was of the House of Commons chiefly for the social advantages which accrued to him through his being there; and while he was intimate with all the leading Whig politicians from the time of Fox to the Melbourne ministry, he apparently carried no weight in their councils, and he certainly made no lasting reputation as a member. So much is this the case that there is no mention of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; and Sir Herbert Maxwell has done but little to trace out Creevey's career.

Creevey was of Irish extraction but was born in Liverpool, where his father was a merchant. He went to Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1786, and after taking his B.A. degree in 1789 he was admitted as a student at the Inner Temple. In 1791, while still a student, he transferred himself to Gray's Inn, and was finally called to the bar in June, 1794. While in Liverpool he had been a friend of Dr. Currie and William Roscoe; and from his association with these prominent members of the

group of Unitarians and reformers then established there, he was a Radical in politics before he was called to the bar. There is no account of his ever having joined a circuit or sought practice at the bar; but in 1802 he went into the House as one of the members for the borough of Thetford, at that time controlled by the eleventh Duke of Norfolk, who as a Roman Catholic could not sit in the House of Lords, but who had it in his power to return five or six members to the House of Commons. Creevey, it need not be said, was a nominated member. With the exception of a few years after he was dropped in 1826 by the Earl of Thanet, he was in the House of Commons from 1802 till 1832, when Downton, the borough he represented in the last unreformed Parliament, was disfranchised by the Reform Act.

The Earl of Thanet was his patron from 1820 to 1826, during which time Creevey represented the Westmorland borough of Appleby. In 1831 he was taken up by the Earl of Radnor, who returned him for the burghage borough of Downton — a borough in which half the ancient vote-houses had long been under water, and the patron of which made it a condition with the members he returned at the general election of 1831 that they should vote for the Reform Bill and incidentally for the disfranchisement of Downton. Creevey was thus of the House of Commons for nearly a quarter of a century. Yet in the whole of his published correspondence there is scarcely a reference to his constituents. Apparently he seldom or never went near them, and he certainly held himself in no responsibility toward them. He was, in fact, a typical nominated member of the last generation of the old House of Commons, governed in his relations to his patrons by the code which had grown up since the seventeenth century regulating the political conduct of nominated members toward the patrons who returned them.

All Creevey's patrons were either Whigs or Radicals; and his relations toward them as well as his own inclinations and interest — for Creevey was always on the lookout for office — made him a steadfast adherent of the Whig party in the House of Commons. His political creed when he entered Parliament in 1802 "was simple and within a very narrow compass — devotion to Fox". His attitude toward his patrons is admirably summed up in a letter he wrote to Miss Ord, his stepdaughter, on the death in 1825 of the Earl of Thanet, by whose interest he then sat for Appleby. "The death of poor Thanet", he wrote, "makes a great difference in my feelings as to Parliamentary attendance. It was due to him to be present at my post. I feel no such obligation to the present Earl, or my dear constituents." His disregard of the new Earl of Thanet apparently cost him his seat at Appleby. He was dropped by Thanet at the general election in 1826; and then turned for a seat at Winchelsea to Lord Darlington, whose boroughmongering later on earned him the dukedom of Cleveland. Creevey had an interview with Lord Darlington, and found that they were of one mind in politics, except on the corn-laws, to the abrogation of which Darlington, as a great landowner, was strongly opposed. "However," explained

Creevey, "any such discussion appeared to me unnecessary, because there was no principle I held more sacred than that when one gentleman held a gratuitous seat in Parliament from another, and any difference arose in their politics, the former was bound in honour to surrender." This was the code which for more than a century preceding the Reform Act governed the attitude of a nominated member to his patron when he had made no cash payment for his seat. Throughout his many years in Parliament, Creevey lived loyally up to this code. The Countess of Stafford, the Duke of Norfolk's mother-in-law, evidently had some part in the ending of Creevey's connection with Thetford; and his correspondence of the periods when he had been dropped by one patron, and was on the hunt for a new one, makes it plain that women at times played quite a part in bringing about the introduction of men who were seeking seats to patrons who had them in their gift.

Creevey had neither money nor influential relatives when he was called to the bar in 1794. How he came to be favorably introduced to his first borough-patron, the Duke of Norfolk, is not recorded. But his becoming of the House of Commons perhaps made him "marriage known", in the phrase that was used in the eighteenth century in connection with needy Irish peers who bought seats in the Parliament at Westminster; for in 1803 he married the widow of William Ord, of Whitfield Hall, Northumberland, whose son was of the House of Commons, first as member for Morpeth and later on for Newcastle-on-Tyne. Mrs. Ord was the daughter of Charles John Brandling, also a member for Newcastle-on-Tyne; and her sister was the wife of Rowland Burdon, member for Durham. His marriage put Creevey in a position of independence as regards money; and his new connections added to his social and parliamentary importance. Creevey had no great talents — none that were calculated to advance him into the front rank of parliamentary life. Neither had he any political ideals. He had, however, social qualities of a kind which were serviceable to a man in public life in the days of the Regency, and a talent for ingratiating himself and making himself useful in society. When the Whigs were in power, these helped him into three easy and well-paid offices: secretary of the Board of Control; treasurer of the Ordnance, with comfortable quarters in the Tower; and a governorship of Chelsea Hospital, an office which he held at the time of his death in 1838.

Students of the great questions which agitated England between the end of the war with France and the beginning of the reign of Queen Victoria will look in vain in the *Creevey Papers* before 1832 for any new material affecting these issues. In this respect these volumes differ from the *Croker Papers*; for Croker was strenuously concerned on the Tory side in all these questions, while Creevey was concerned chiefly with the overthrow of the Tories and the redistribution of offices which was to follow their downfall. But concerning the various groups in the Tory and Liberal parties between the peace after Waterloo and the reform of the House of Commons, there is an abundance of material, much of it

undoubtedly fresh and of value; while of the personalities of English politics of this period it is doubtful whether there is a biography in existence which cannot be further enriched by citations from the Creevey journals and letters. The period was a sordid one, and its seamy side is often prominent in Creevey's descriptions of his contemporaries. Grey's reputation is enhanced by Creevey's memoirs; so is the Duke of Wellington's; but in hardly any other set of memoirs is Brougham shown in a worse light, or is there a more positively depressing picture of the state into which royalty had fallen in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century.

Much the same tone prevails with regard to political parties. Except for the adherence of the Whigs to reform, there was very little to choose between them and the Tories; for both viewed the spoils of office in the same light. From the point of view of party history Creevey's memoirs are most serviceable in showing the condition of the Whig party in the years between the death of Fox and the accession of Grey to the leadership—in the period when Ponsonby and Tierney, both of whom had been of the Irish House of Commons, were in charge of the fortunes of the Whigs and Radicals in the lower house at Westminster. There is an informing chapter covering Creevey's visit to Ireland in 1828, especially valuable for the light it throws on the condition of Ireland between the Union and the emancipation of the Roman Catholics in 1829. For the three years 1830, 1831, and 1832 also Creevey's letters and journals are of unquestionable usefulness. He was behind the scenes during the final stages of the movement for reform; and his correspondence at this critical time forms a serviceable addition to the *Correspondence of William IV. and Grey*; Grey's *Letters to Princess Lieven*; and the *Croker Papers*.

It is fortunate that the Creevey Papers have been unearthed; but the discoverer of them can scarcely have realized their full value, or he would have taken more trouble with his biographical sketch of Creevey, and would have given closer and more continuous attention to the editing of the material and especially to the foot-notes. These are unevenly and capriciously done. Many instances of this could be cited. It will be sufficient, however, to cite Creevey's Liverpool friends, Dr. Currie and William Roscoe. No one would imagine from Sir Herbert Maxwell's brief notes introducing these correspondents of Creevey's that both of them were active Liberal politicians to whom places will have to be assigned in any comprehensive history of Liberalism and Nonconformity in England.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Studies in Napoleonic Statesmanship: Germany. By HERBERT A. L. FISHER, M.A., Fellow of New College. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1903. Pp. xii, 392.)

MR. FISHER is not an apologist for the Napoleonic régime. He points out in detail its inherent defects and the extortions which were

practised under it. And yet the tone of his exposition leaves with the reader the impression that there were times and occasions when that régime was not entirely unrelieved by the consciousness of benevolent intentions. And so far as some of its subordinate instruments are concerned, that is true. But they were so seldom free agents in their respective spheres that their purposes and incidental achievements cannot properly be counted for righteousness when judgment is passed upon the whole.

To the two phases of Napoleon's political activity in Germany, its territorial reconstruction and the imposition of the French administrative system upon the states over which his sway was undisputed, equal space is given. The first part of the book is a sketch of the conquests, secularization, and confiscation that took place during the ten years between Campo Formio and Tilsit. The second part treats of the economic conditions and the administrative innovations in Berg, Westphalia, Frankfurt, and the Hanse towns from Tilsit to the Russian campaign. There is an additional chapter upon the Rhine departments and their advancement under the Consulate and Empire.

It will be seen that neither of these fields is completely covered. There were territorial alterations after 1807, and there were extensions of French governmental methods before and after that date, which the author leaves untouched. In Prussia, too, during the period of humiliation, even though she managed to escape further dismemberment and submission to French bureaucratic control, Napoleonic statesmanship brought forth abundant fruit after its kind. Concerning his motives the master frankly unbosomed himself to his agents. To Beugnot, who protested against the tobacco monopoly in Berg, he wrote: "It is not a question of your duchy but of France. I know well that you will gain nothing by it; it is possible that you may lose, and what matter if France obtain a profit?" (p. 220). To Metternich, speaking of Dalberg, who submitted a draft of a constitution for the Confederation of the Rhine, he said:

I will tell you my secret. The small people in Germany want to be protected against the big: the big want to govern according to their fancy; now as I only want a federation of men and of money, and as it is the big people and not the small people who can give me the one and the other, I leave the former in peace, and the latter must get on as best they can (p. 165).

The demand for men and money is the significant feature of Napoleonic government in Germany, because its enforcement paralyzed productive industry and dislocated the social order. If these be not the complete measure of the value of all political institutions, certainly without them constitutions and codes have no reason for their existence. What profit had the grand duchy of Berg, for example, in the possession of "the first enlightened and comprehensive municipal ordinance" that Germany had known, or in the building of good roads, or the abolition of internal customs-duties, or the sweeping away of "mediæval detritus"? All changes of this sort may be useful upon occasion, but they

should not be identified with the final and absolute good. The worth of machines of any sort depends upon the uses to which they are put. In a community that groans under a system of organized pillage, wood paths and thickets may be more serviceable as avenues of escape than the smooth pavements of public highways.

In Berg the French organized a state with a population of three millions, who gained their livelihood chiefly from the industries of iron, steel, wool, cotton, and silk. The improved governmental machinery was applied, and in five years the export trade was reduced from 60,000,000 to 11,000,000 francs, first, by cutting off the foreign market, second, by refusing to open a new market in France, and third, by wholesale confiscations of the raw material in sight. As the resources of the state diminished, the burdens increased, first, by the enlargement of the military establishment in five years from one regiment to nearly 10,000 men at an annual cost of more than 4,000,000 francs, and after the Russian disaster by an additional conscription of more than 4,000 men. Additional burdens were imposed by contributions to support a French army of occupation, which in 1810 numbered 12,000 men, by a further war contribution of 1,500,000 francs, and by the appropriation of 250,000 francs per annum from the state domains and other sums for pensions to the relatives and generals of the emperor. If Mr. Fisher had called his book "*Studies in Napoleonic Spoliation in Germany*", he would have given it a more descriptive title.

JOHN H. CONEY.

The South American Republics. By THOMAS C. DAWSON, Secretary of the United States Legation to Brazil. In two volumes. Vol. I., Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Brazil. [Story of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 525.)

THE general plan of the work is to follow an introductory chapter on "The Discoveries and the Conquest" by separate parts devoted to the east coast countries in the first volume, and to those of the west and north coasts in the second. Of this volume about two hundred and twenty-five pages are devoted to Brazil, one hundred and twenty-five to Argentina, and sixty each to Paraguay and Uruguay. There are some sixty illustrations that are in the main well-chosen, but the three maps are a disgrace to the publishers.

It is not easy to estimate the weight of new statements in a book that has no foot-notes, no distinct references to authorities, and only a short list of books that "have been of use in the preparation of the first volume". But when this list is preceded by a statement that "Personal observations through a residence of six years in South America; conversations with public men, scholars, merchants, and proprietors; newspapers and reviews, political pamphlets, books of travel, and official publications, have furnished me with most of my material for the

period since 1825" (p. vi), the task becomes less difficult. Yet is it fair even then to proceed upon the supposition that apart from "personal observations", etc., only those books have been used which are mentioned? Take, for instance, the list of authorities on Paraguay. Although it is very short, it includes Graham's *A Vanished Arcadia*, but makes not the slightest mention of such standard writers as Charlevoix, Muratori, Dobrizhoffer, Rengger, Graty, Burton, Hutchinson, or Robertson. If they have been used, why is the weight of their prestige not added to the list? If they have not, it becomes difficult to recommend Mr. Dawson's account of Paraguay. Judged on its own merits, there is little which entitles it to serious consideration, except its brevity. In a varying degree, the same criticism applies to the other countries. A few good secondary authorities seem to have furnished the material for the early periods, while a large general knowledge of present conditions has enabled Mr. Dawson to treat the modern period with considerable skill.

There are so few available works on South American history that one is tempted to regard this book as an addition to our knowledge of the general subject, even though its title limits it to the history of the past hundred years. If this is carefully borne in mind, and the reader conscientiously omits all the chapters dealing with prerevolutionary times, Mr. Dawson's book can be heartily recommended, for it does give an admirable exposition of recent history on the east coast of South America. But those who persist in reading a book through "from cover to cover" must be warned against underestimating Mr. Dawson's account of events in the nineteenth century, after finding certain statements about the earlier times that have become obsolete. For instance, we read in the introductory chapter that Columbus went forth "convinced that there were islands in the far Atlantic waiting to be discovered" (p. 8), and "showed strategic genius of the highest order in choosing Hayti as the site of the first settlement" as affording an "admirable base for the conquest of the New World" (p. 10). Historical ideas of fifty years ago are still further called to mind when one reads of "Spanish columns" marching over "magnificent mountain roads". Furthermore it is somewhat disconcerting to find it stated that "At the very moment that Charles V. was crushing Peninsular freedom by brutal military force, the genius of Magellan and Cortes gave him the whole of America. Spain had heretofore been a federation of self-governing communes and provinces, but their independence was now destroyed" (p. 20).

After such an introduction it is difficult to realize that when Mr. Dawson reaches the War of Emancipation he is thoroughly trustworthy; but such is the fact. The misleading manifestos of the period have been given their fair valuation, and the conditions preceding the war are well set forth. Here is the cause of the war in a nutshell: "The Spaniards wished to retain their privileged position; the Creoles were determined to put an end to discrimination against themselves" (p. 89). While every one has heard of Bolivar, few have heard of San Martin;

and yet he did for the southern half of the continent what Bolivar did for the northern half. Our ignorance of him is due to the fact that "Unlike his predecessors and colleagues, he did not concern himself with political ambitions". "He had none of the brilliantly attractive qualities, none of the eloquence or charm of most South American leaders; he had a horror of display, and made but one speech in all his life" (p. 98). In the period following the War of Emancipation, one cannot help admiring the skill with which Mr. Dawson has unraveled the tangled skein of revolution and counter-revolution. The account of the growth and development of Argentina is especially illuminative, and has that graphic quality which comes from personal intercourse with the leaders in the state. After reading the six chapters devoted to Uruguay, chapters filled with incessant strife between *blancos* and *colorados*, one marvels at the unreasonableness of it all. Apparently the best explanation that can be offered is simply human greed and selfishness. "As is usual in South America, the dominant party split into factions, led by ambitious chiefs" (p. 273), and the fighting began all over again. In the part devoted to Brazil Mr. Dawson is at his best. He is thoroughly familiar with the subject, and treats it with marked admiration. He even ventures to assert that Brazil "is destined within the next two centuries to support the largest population of any of the great political divisions of the globe" (p. 289).

One has constantly to make due allowance for Mr. Dawson's enthusiasm and for his fondness for the superlative, but rarely does one meet with such an able exposition of South American politics. The second volume will be welcomed with interest. HIRAM BINGHAM.

Texas: a Contest of Civilizations. By GEORGE P. GARRISON. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1903. Pp. vii, 320.)

THE general plan and method of the "American Commonwealths" series, to which this volume belongs, are too familiar to need explanation. The appearance of new books belonging to this series is a matter of something more than local interest, since they are intended for a larger class of readers than are other books on state history, and for that reason are apt to be accepted at home and abroad as the standard accounts of the growth of the different states and the contributions they have made to our national life. Dr. Garrison has for several years been professor of history in the University of Texas, and has devoted much attention to the history of that state. He is, therefore, thoroughly qualified to write authoritatively on the subject to which this book is devoted. As is stated in the preface, the book "is not intended for a history of Texas", but rather "a study" based on the history of that state. Such a study involves more or less extensive investigation into the history of Spain, France, England, Mexico, and the United States. This work seems to have been carefully done by Professor Garrison, since one of the strongest features of his book is the skilful presentation of these necessary European connections.

The three types of Spanish settlements in Texas — ecclesiastical, military, and civil — are also treated with skill. The author very properly attributes the failure of the Spaniards in their efforts to occupy Texas to the expenditure of energy on the first two of these colonial types to the neglect of the third. He says that "While upwards of twenty-five missions and presidios were founded first and last on Texas soil, there were, when the Anglo-Americans began to pour in, but three centres of Spanish population between the Sabine and the Rio Grande: San Antonio, Goliad, and Nacogdoches." The chapter on "The Beginnings of San Antonio" is so replete with interest that, although the author says it was the most important of the three settlements, the reader cannot help regretting that the history of the other two early centers of Spanish population were not given a similar treatment.

The complication over the adjustment of the boundary line between the French province of Louisiana and the Spanish province of Texas afforded an occasion for many plots and counter-plots on the part of the officers of the two nations in the New World. The question was finally settled by the surrender of western Louisiana to Spain in 1762. The author gives in this connection an interesting account of the career of Saint-Denis, that master of intrigue whose true place in history has puzzled many historians of the Old Southwest.

The discussion of the "Anglo-American Invasions" constitutes one of the most interesting chapters in the book. The first recorded expedition into Texas by citizens of the United States was led by Philip Nolan between 1799 and 1801. The author says that it has been surmised that President Jefferson had a hand in this matter. The Jefferson manuscripts in the Department of State at Washington contain nothing to substantiate such a conjecture. Some of the letters in this collection from William Dunbar of the Mississippi Territory refer to Nolan as a man well versed in the natural history of the remote west. Mr. Jefferson seems to have been interested in Nolan only because of the information he was capable of imparting relative to the nature and habits of mustang ponies, the sign language of the Indians, and subjects of a similar nature. The last filibustering expedition was made in 1819 under the leadership of James Long, a merchant of Natchez. After the separation of Mexico from Spain in 1821 the Anglo-Americans adopted the more effective method of peaceful occupation. The filibuster gave way to the colonist. The most important colony was established by Stephen Austin. In speaking of this colony, the author says that "the revolution of 1836, annexation, the Mexican war, the acquisitions made by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and the marvelous development of Texas and California" constitute a "chain of events" which have "followed, 'as the night the day', the work planned and begun by Moses Austin and carried out by his son Stephen".

The Fredonian war, which to the superficial student was merely a fiasco, is shown by Professor Garrison to occupy a significant place in Texas history, since it was "the first violent clash between the Mexicans

and the colonists" from the United States, and marked the beginning of the development which culminated in the siege of the Alamo and the battle of San Jacinto. The book presents a clear discussion of the causes of the Revolution and of the various plans of government that were advocated during this interesting period of Texas history. The account of the siege of the Alamo is graphic and stirring. The experience of the Republic and the events leading to annexation are also succinctly stated. The error made by those people who think that "the colonization of Texas and the revolution was the work of the 'slavocracy'" is very properly pointed out by Professor Garrison.

The author discusses in a very satisfactory way the educational and economic progress of Texas, but, strange to say, has very little to say about the religious development of the state. The importance of this subject demands that it should have more space than is given it in this book. The closing chapter, on "The Texas of To day", is replete with interesting information skilfully presented, and makes a very satisfactory conclusion to this valuable contribution to American history.

FRANKLIN L. RILEY.

Admiral Porter. By JAMES RUSSELL SOLEY, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy. [Great Commanders Series.] (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1903. Pp. x, 499.)

MR. JAMES RUSSELL SOLEY'S long-expected life of Admiral Porter has finally appeared and fulfilled all the expectations based on the character of the subject and the known ability and special knowledge of the author.

Porter was a great sea-officer; it is not too much to say, one of the greatest. If there is anything in heredity, he was a marked instance. Begotten in time of war, his qualities were naturally such as should have come from such a father as was the famous captain of the frigate *Essex*, with whose great successes in the Pacific his birth was coincident. The boy was bred in an atmosphere steeped with the romance of the sea, and his later life was but a continuation of as picturesque and romanceful a history as the sea produced in the last century. One must hark back to Elizabethan days for a parallel to the lives of this remarkable father and son. The father left the service through pique on account of what he regarded an unjust court-martial, the result of taking into his own hands the punishment of the authorities of a little town in Porto Rico for maltreating one of his officers who had landed in search of pirates. He was offered and accepted the command of the naval force of Mexico, then establishing her independence of Spain, and carried with him young David, then nearly thirteen, as a midshipman. The boy saw in this capacity three years of wild adventure and a great deal of fighting under the immediate command of his cousin David H. Porter, who had also taken service under the Mexican government. But his career as a Mexican naval officer was closed in the desperate action fought by the brig *Guerrero* off Havana with the Spanish frigate *Lealtad*, in which his

cousin was killed with a loss of eighty others. When released from prison in Havana, his father having given up his Mexican command, young Porter was sent to school in Chester, Pennsylvania, to remain a year only, when on January 2, 1829, he was appointed a midshipman in the United States Navy.

Porter's service in the war with Mexico was notable for vigorous action, as was indeed all his service in the old navy wherever opportunity offered. The outbreak of the Civil War, however, found him at forty-seven dissatisfied and despairing of advancement, and he was about sailing for California with a view to giving up the service for good and all, when his intention was overturned by orders from President Lincoln to take command of the *Powhatan* to form a part of an expedition for the relief of Fort Pickens and the reoccupancy of Pensacola navy-yard. This extraordinary episode, one of the most astonishing in the whole administration of our own or of any government, shows with perfect completeness the want of system to which our military and naval services have always been prone through want of anything like a general staff. The story is one to mark a moral, and should be read by every one who has views on military matters. While Porter himself cannot be excused altogether, his conduct while in command did him honor, and had he had the direction of affairs, instead of the incompetent officer in command of Fort Pickens under whose control the whole expedition was so improperly placed, the navy-yard, we have every reason to suppose, would have been saved, and ordnance and stores preserved instead of going to supply the batteries of the Confederate strongholds of the southwest.

One good result of Porter's command, however, was the directing of his attention to the opening of the Mississippi, of which he was the immediate instigator. It was only his rank which deprived him of the chief command of the expedition. The final selection of Farragut as leader (in early life an adopted member of the Porter family) was chiefly due to him. Porter, however, though a junior officer, was the only divisional commander in the fleet, having under him the twenty-seven vessels of the mortar flotilla, which was his own creation, and which did most effective service before Forts Jackson and St. Philip. The prominence given Porter in Farragut's councils is made clear in the admirably recited events of the campaign. Though the story is one in which the commander-in-chief is, of course, the great figure, Porter is shown to be a fine second. It is incidentally stated that General Barnard was strongly opposed to the passage of the forts; to pass them and appear before New Orleans was, he said, "merely a raid, no capture" (p. 149).

The episode of the Fort Pickens expedition may be said to have had a controlling influence on Porter's career, as it would seem unquestionable that to the president's personal interest, first aroused by the contact thus brought about, was due his appointment as acting rear-admiral and his selection to command the Mississippi squadron in August, 1862. He was thus advanced over some eighty officers of higher rank, some of whom were serving in the same squadron. This is a power granted the presi-

dent only in war, and its exercise in this instance was more than justified. Porter's work on the Mississippi and its tributaries is a heroic story reflecting the utmost honor upon himself and the service. He showed himself as strong in disaster as in success. His high qualities never appeared to greater advantage than in the disastrous Red River expedition.

When Farragut declined the command of the Fort Fisher expedition, Porter was thus the natural and necessary choice of the Navy Department. The reduction of Fort Fisher and the capture of Wilmington mark the close of his great operations. He was present in the James river when Richmond fell, and was detached from the command of the North Atlantic squadron, April 28, 1865, four years and twenty-seven days after the reception of his orders to command the *Powhatan*. He had thus been on active service from start to finish with the exception of a month's leave of absence before taking command of the Mississippi squadron.

Mr. Soley has written a fascinating and inspiring book. Porter was too great an officer to disappear into the background of history for the want of a historian, and though we have waited long, the right one has finally come to do him justice. The book is admirable in all respects, and, while the author is enthusiastic for his hero, he would seem not unduly so in the light of General Grant's statement, quoted at the end, and made after the general had retired to private life: "Among naval officers, I have always placed Porter in the highest rank. I believe Porter to be as great an admiral as Lord Nelson. Some of his achievements during our war were wonderful. He was always ready for every emergency and every responsibility."

F. E. CHADWICK.

A History of the Greenbacks with Special Reference to the Economic Consequences of their Issue: 1862-1865. By WESLEY CLAIR MITCHELL. [Decennial Publications, Second Series, Volume IX.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1903. Pp. xvi, 577.)

THIS volume is of triple interest: to the student of history it gives a careful investigation and an orderly arrangement of a part of the federal financial legislation enacted during the Civil War; for economists there is an interesting example of economic analysis; and the statistician is supplied with suggestive applications of statistical method. Part I. (pp. 3-131) treats of the history of the legal-tender acts; Part II. (pp. 135-420) of their consequences; and the appendixes (pp. 423-567) contain tables laboriously and ingeniously compiled for the purpose of elucidating the analysis undertaken in Part II.

The more strictly historical portion treats in successive chapters of the suspension of specie payments; of the first, second, and third legal-tender acts; and of "how further issues of greenbacks were avoided in 1864 and 1865". The chapter on the suspension of specie payments is practically a reprint of an article in the *Journal of Political Economy* (VII. 289-326). The account of the suspension, as well as that of the parliamentary details connected with the passage of the first legal-tender act, February 25, 1862, has been written many times, but Mr. Mitchell has

gleaned the documentary material of the period much more carefully than his predecessors; his study may well be considered the definitive treatment of the subject. The narrative is clear and free from the carping criticism which characterizes so many of the histories of the early financiering of the Civil War. The author has refrained from condemning Chase for refusing to modify the subtreasury system in the autumn of 1861; nor does he believe that suspension could have been avoided. "To assume that the banks could have continued indefinitely to carry their double burden—supplying both government and public with loans—is to assume that no serious reverse would have befallen the national credit." Chase is also judged lightly in the analysis of responsibility for the passage of the legal-tender bill; and this opinion is the more interesting as its publication in periodical form in 1899 anticipated Professor Hart's favorable estimate. As to the real need of issuing legal-tender treasury notes, Mr. Mitchell decides in the negative; if the three months of January, February, and March, 1862, had been utilized energetically in passing a simple internal-revenue measure, sufficient bonds might have been obtained. The more immediate question, however, for Congress to decide, as the author clearly recognizes, was whether it was expedient to sell bonds at a discount. A decided contribution has been made in narrating the history of the second and third legal-tender acts. In most of our histories, even those characterized as financial, this latter legislation has been glossed over as if the question were settled once for all in 1862.

The chapters on the economic consequences of the legal-tender acts are carefully worked out. They include a description of the circulating medium; a study of the specie value of paper currency, of prices, wages, rents, interest, and profits, as affected by paper inflation. There is a final chapter on the cost of the Civil War. Three of these studies have been previously treated in the *Journal of Political Economy*, but as they now appear in an entirely new form; as deliberate conclusions they therefore merit the more serious consideration. The notes are full and precise; the same may be said of the index. Personally, I regret the omission of the page of charts which originally illustrated the helpful study on the value of greenbacks. It is easy to overwork the diagram habit, and the initiated should always exercise a prudent restraint, but this particular page printed in the *Journal of Political Economy*, which explains the effects of military reverses and successes, might well have been included in the permanent record.

DAVIS R. DEWEY.

The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. By JOHN MORLEY, M.P., D.C.L., LL.D. In three volumes. Vol. I., 1809–1859; Vol. II., 1859–1880; Vol. III., 1880–1898. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd. 1903. Pp. xii, 661; viii, 666; x, 641.)

DURING Mr. Gladstone's lifetime Lord Rosebery had the temerity to tell him that it would require a syndicate to write his life; "nobody

that ever lived tried to ride so many horses abreast", says Mr. Morley. A witty opponent once described him as "an ardent Italian in the custody of a Scotsman"; he might indeed have added that he was a hide-bound Conservative in the custody of a Radical, for with all Mr. Gladstone's capacity to lead in sweeping changes, he was, when not pressed by external circumstances, hardly of the nineteenth century. In his extraordinary Homeric studies he rejected the whole critical method that lies at the basis of modern advance in historical inquiry. On the whole he was fortunate in his career, and he is fortunate in his biographer. Mr. Morley shared his political views and responsibilities; he was also a close personal friend; yet he is, in some respects, so much unlike Mr. Gladstone that he can view the great man's foibles with humorous appreciation. Nothing is more touching and skilful in this work than the treatment of the dominant interest in Mr. Gladstone's life, his religious convictions. Mr. Morley's own views are well known; he is no believer in Christian dogmas, and yet he is fair and even expansive in regard to this side of Mr. Gladstone. "Wrestlings in prayer" recur again and again in the narrative, and they are treated with the fine sympathy that such sacred convictions demand.

In the career of a great statesman it is important to study not only what he did, but the qualities in him that made for success or failure. That Mr. Gladstone did much is evident in the fact that he had and has indeed still many haters—a tribute to his strength, for we do not hate what is weak. These three volumes chronicle in sufficient detail every phase of his public life. He once spoke of the extreme slowness of his own political education, and indeed the transition from the champion in 1832 of the unreformed House of Commons to the latter-day revolutionary exponent of Irish self-government appears in these volumes like a slow process of nature. The interval between these two events will possibly be regarded by posterity as the most important in human history. In it arose the fabric of modern civilization, with its steam and electric power, its new light on the making of the worlds, its passion for equality of rights, its reorganization of the polity of nations, not only in the west, but, as we are beginning to see, in the east too. In these spacious times Mr. Gladstone played a striking part, sometimes as the enemy, often as the friend of change and progress. He was one of the first to make the cry of oppressed Italy heard in Europe, though he was long in learning sympathy with Italian unification; he was a member of a cabinet that carried on the Crimean War; when the American Civil War took place, he played a conspicuous and not satisfactory part in the relations between the two Anglo-Saxon nations; he had some share in preliminaries connected with the Franco-German War, and in the liberation of eastern Europe from the Turk; he helped Greece, he helped Bulgaria and Montenegro. It was his cabinet that had to set up British supremacy in Egypt, and that made Afghanistan a willing vassal state to England. During the fatal era of Majuba Hill his government ruled South Africa. In home politics his place is not less conspicuous. He

fought against the first Reform Bill; he fought with Peel for free corn; he reorganized the whole basis of British finance; and it was he who led in enfranchising the rural laborer. Surely there is hardly to be found in history a more remarkable career. If no striking revelations are now given in regard to these events, Mr. Gladstone's share is still described with masterly lucidity. Mr. Morley has the statesman's insight, and to give Mr. Gladstone's career an adequate historical setting he furnishes full sketches of such incidents as the *Alabama* controversy, the causes of the Franco-German War, and the tangle in South Africa that led to the recent war. The book is of course especially full on the Irish question. We must not forget that Mr. Morley was himself Chief Secretary for Ireland.

But after all it is Mr. Gladstone the man, with his great hold upon his fellow-countrymen, that this book reveals. Here we may say reveals, because Mr. Morley alone has had access to the existing records of Mr. Gladstone's inner life. Professor Huxley once said, "Put him [Gladstone] in the middle of a moor, with nothing in the world but his shirt, and you could not prevent him from being anything he liked" (II. 562). Mr. Morley says truly that not since Cromwell's time had England a statesman who so kept religion and a passion for humanity to the fore. With this intensity of conviction there was a fiery energy based upon remarkable physical powers. Few men could attempt what Mr. Gladstone did. When he was seventy, he could take a walk of thirty-three miles with pleasure. For considerable periods he would work fourteen hours a day. It is true that he speaks of much exhaustion after his work, but what only exhausted him would have killed others.

England has never been fond of doctrinaire politics. It is not easy, Mr. Morley himself has said elsewhere, to wind an Englishman up to the level of dogma. It may be doubted whether free trade as representing a body of theories would have touched the English apart from the injustice to the poor caused by the corn-laws. Mr. Gladstone was not a doctrinaire, but perhaps more than any other great leader he based his successive policies on high theoretical grounds. In every well-ordered society a balance of interests and restraint has been developed, and not without alarm do men see a disturbance of such a system proposed. This is the conservative point of view long held by Mr. Gladstone. But in time he came to believe that there was more danger to society from cramping restraints than from complete liberty. The chief conviction that ripened in him was this belief in liberty. He would remove restrictions, and trust to the fundamental instincts of mankind. In time he came to believe that every man not incapacitated in some special manner is entitled to a voice in regard to government. Such a proposition, in its most important interpretation, meant votes for the laboring classes—a goal that the Reform Bill of 1832 had left far from realization. In England, indeed, as recently as 1835, it had been thought subversive of accepted principles that even the son of a manufacturer should become prime minister. "Will you allow me", Peel said in that year, "to recall to

your recollection what was the grand charge against myself — that the King had sent for the son of a cotton-spinner . . . to make him Prime Minister of England?" At a later time Queen Victoria herself looked with profound distrust on Mr. Gladstone's alliance with Radicals; she dreaded enthusiasm, and the language of new men like Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke alarmed her. She watched every utterance of leading men, and her plain-speaking and censures, as they are suggested in these volumes, show that the crown still plays a part in political life. Mr. Gladstone himself had aristocratic instincts. It is easy to see that with his temperament he would have found it delightful to belong to one of the old noble families. But if his tastes were with the aristocrat, his principles were with the mob, and though his growth toward democracy was slow, he was always sure of his ground. It was under him that high political office for men of the people became possible.

As prime minister and as chancellor of the exchequer Mr. Gladstone was the master of British finance for about twenty-two years. It was the work that he specially loved. It is clear that his impatience, his strength of character, his aversion to yield even on trifles, made him a hard master, but he was in earnest; there was abundant conviction and sincerity, and he spared no pains to understand his problems. He watched expenditure with eagle eyes, and was not above urging such small economies as less expensive stationery at the Foreign Office. Peel grew blasé as a leader and complained overmuch of the burdens of office. Mr. Gladstone had always a healthy interest in his day's work, and it is comforting to know that the most experienced politician of his age never took a somber view of human nature. Mr. Morley shows that there was a limit to his range of interests. Oddly enough, the great issue of 1870 regarding elementary education, perhaps the most important question he ever faced, aroused in him but slight zeal. He had not the artistic temperament; he cared little for architecture, and one suspects that his love for the poets Homer and Dante was due more to interest in a classical language and in the problems of early society and of religion than to poetic insight; he was less drawn to Shakespeare than to foreign masters. Only when face to face with the facts of life does he appear to have used fully the sober constructive qualities of his mind and to have been really simple. His memoranda noting important interviews with the queen and others are terse and lucid in style, but in his library, dealing with abstract questions, he becomes involved and obscure. Almost nothing that he wrote has any prospect of long life.

Mr. Gladstone was fond of saying that his life was spent in working the institutions of his country; and these volumes are largely a study of the methods of political propaganda in Britain. On the whole the effect is not depressing; the Tories have some bad quarters of an hour at Mr. Morley's hands, but in Mr. Gladstone's many controversies the venom that the leaders on each side show is largely academic. During a fierce controversy on the Franchise Bill of 1884, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury were daily taking afternoon tea together in the effort to reach

an agreement, and the criticism of the Liberal chief upon his Conservative opponent is that he has no respect for tradition! The home-rule agitation that followed evoked more bitter feelings, but each leader had, and showed, a real respect for the other.

Mr. Morley has given us an instructive study in these and other aspects of political life. He does not profess impartiality; in this respect the biographer has more license than the historian. He is a master of style ranking now with such a veteran as Mr. Goldwin Smith, and he has corrected his work so carefully that mistakes are not easily found. We may note that the army allowed by Napoleon to Prussia was 42,000 and not 40,000 (II. 349), and there is a confusion of persons on the last line of Volume II., page 552.

The "brazen glories of war" find little place in the book. In view of vehement controversies, Mr. Morley's statement is interesting that Mr. Gladstone took no personal part in the sending to the Soudan of General Gordon, and that he never saw that hero. Posterity will probably say that Mr. Gladstone showed too great facility in convincing himself and others in regard to new measures, "that what they took for a yawning gulf was in fact no more than a narrow trench that any decent political gymnast ought to be ashamed not to be able to vault over" (III. 185). None the less does this able and frank exposition convince us of the truth of Mr. Spurgeon's fine tribute: "We believe in no man's infallibility, but it is restful to be sure of one man's integrity" (II. 531).

To each volume is added a helpful chronology of Mr. Gladstone's activities.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Benjamin Disraeli: an Unconventional Biography. By WILFRID MEYNELL. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1903. Pp. xxi, 520.)

THE publication of Morley's *Life of Gladstone* and the recent renewal of the protectionist agitation have combined to arouse public interest in the career of Lord Beaconsfield. Mr. Meynell's study, then, is timely; it is also interesting and suggestive; but unfortunately it does not meet our needs. The life of the great Conservative statesman, or adventurer, if you prefer, has yet to be written. The many so-called biographies that have appeared from time to time are, for the most part, mere political manifestos, either bitter vituperations or flattering panegyrics. To Macknight (1854) and O'Connor (1879) Disraeli is the unscrupulous Jewish adventurer, the personification of inconsistency. The characters in his novels, especially his villains, are quoted to prove that he was a worthy disciple of Machiavelli. The lives by Mill (1863) and Hitchman (1879) are just as prejudiced in the other direction. Froude's volume in "The Queen's Prime Ministers" series contains some suggestive material, but it was written without adequate preparation and is characterized by the author's usual pessimism. Bryce's study is thorough, and it is convincing, provided the reader is a worshiper at the Gladstone

shrine; but it is merely an essay, not a biography. Perhaps the best life which has yet appeared is that by Georg Brandes, the eminent Danish critic, which was translated into English in 1880. The works of Keble and Cucheval-Clarigny are also valuable. The death of Lord Rowton has unfortunately delayed the writing of an authorized biography of Beaconsfield, but it is rumored that some one, probably Sir Herbert Maxwell, will soon take charge of his papers and complete the work.

Meynell describes his book as "an unconventional biography", "a cross-breed . . . between biography and autobiography". Quotations from Beaconsfield's conversations, speeches, letters, and novels are followed by comments in the author's breezy style. One of the sections dealing with Gladstone, for example, is introduced by the question "What is the difference between a misfortune and a calamity?", which somebody once asked of Disraeli. The reply was, "Well, if Gladstone fell into the Thames, that would be a misfortune; and if anybody pulled him out, that, I suppose, would be a calamity." Disraeli's famous characterization of Gladstone as "a sophisticated rhetorician inebriated by the exuberance of his own verbosity and gifted with an egotistical imagination that at all times commanded an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign his opponents and justify himself" (p. 466) is interesting and essentially Disraelian, but the reviewer can see no reason why it should be repeated on page 497. This and many similar cases of repetition could easily have been avoided, if the author had made his own index.

The book is an admirable study of Disraeli the man, of his home life, his dinner parties, his friendships, his hatred of lawyers, his fondness for gay waistcoats, his admiration of South German art, and the like. Scattered here and there throughout the volume are also various references to his public career, but the reader will be disappointed if he expects to find anything like a consistent, logical treatment. Certain controverted questions are taken up and discussed in great detail, always with the idea of placing Disraeli in the most favorable light. The defense of his conduct in the quarrel with Daniel O'Connell, however, is by no means convincing (pp. 204-250). About all that Meynell succeeds in proving is that the O'Connell-Hume letters of recommendation (1832) were written, not at Disraeli's personal request, but through the mediation of his friend Bulwer-Lytton. He makes out a better case, however, in the Peel-Disraeli controversy (pp. 294-340). The traditional Whig account of Disraeli's application to Sir Robert for office and of his repulse is correct, but to represent that as the primary cause of the breach is puerile. The differences were based upon principle, not upon personal antagonism. Disraeli was consistent, while Peel permitted himself to be led by Cobden and Bright away from the old Tory principles of protection. Therein lies the secret of Disraeli's success. When Peel disrupted his party by supporting the repeal of the corn-laws, Disraeli stepped into the breach as the champion of the agricultural interest, and by sheer force of ability worked his way to the top. As

Bryce well says, the task was made easy because there has always been a dearth of brains in the Tory party. If Disraeli had been a Whig, he would have found many rivals, but as a Tory he had a free field.

It has often been said that Disraeli was inconsistent. But what English statesman of his day was not? On that score he will certainly compare favorably with Gladstone or with the Sage of Birmingham. Even in the O'Connell case, although we must admit that he was ungrateful, we can hardly accuse him of inconsistency. The fight for Catholic emancipation and for parliamentary reform almost completely destroyed the old party lines. Disraeli in 1832 was neither a Whig nor a Tory; he was simply a Radical. As such he sought and secured the assistance of O'Connell, who was himself estranged from the Whigs at that time. When the parties began to settle again along their old lines, O'Connell saw fit to rejoin the Whigs, whereas Disraeli became a Tory. He was, though, as Meynell says, always a Radical Tory. Like the Pitts, he hated the aristocracy which had controlled the Whig party throughout its career, and which in his own day was securing too great influence among the Tories. He democratized the Tory party, prevented it from deserting entirely the principles of protection, and started it on its career of imperialism. When he made his sarcastic comment on Joseph Chamberlain's first speech, that "he wore his eye-glass like a gentleman", he would have been greatly surprised to know that within a quarter of a century Chamberlain would be following in his footsteps and fighting the battle for the preservation of the British Empire.

W. ROY SMITH.

Autobiography of Seventy Years. By GEORGE F. HOAR. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Two vols., pp. ix, 434; viii, 493.)

THE autobiography of Senator Hoar is a delightful book to read, filled with anecdote and humor, permeated with cheerfulness and optimism, honest, direct, and enthusiastic — in short, exactly what one would expect from its honored author. In scope the work is rather narrower than many of the other important autobiographical writings of the past few years, such as Blaine's *Twenty Years of Congress*, Sherman's *Recollections*, and the books of McCulloch and Boutwell in the same field; for it does not deal with the history of the United States in any sense, but simply with the career of George F. Hoar. Since this was almost wholly legislative, events of a military or administrative character are ignored, and the resulting limitation of subject adds greatly to the unity of interest of the work. The first chapters deal with the author's ancestry, boyhood, and school-days — in many respects they are the most graphic and entertaining in the two volumes — and are followed by a narrative of Mr. Hoar's career in the stormy state politics of Massachusetts during the Free-soil movement. Then comes the history of Mr. Hoar's legislative services, first in the House of Representatives and later in the Senate, to

which are added occasional parenthetical chapters dealing with the Republican national conventions attended by Mr. Hoar, his European journeys, and his reminiscences of lawyers, orators, and other distinguished men. Merely to enumerate the important events in which Mr. Hoar took part during this long career would be impossible in a review of moderate dimensions; suffice it to say that from the time he entered the House, in 1869, to the present day there has scarcely been any significant political episode in Congress in which he did not play an actual part, modestly and most entertainingly described in these two volumes.

But perhaps the strongest impression derived from the nine hundred pages is the revelation of character they contain, and this in spite of the fact that the author's private life is passed over for the most part in silence or with a few references of perfect modesty and dignity. Yet since it is not the province of the REVIEW to study the man himself, but rather the historical significance of the work, one must pass by the tempting opportunity and touch upon those traits only that affect the accuracy and historical value of the descriptions of men and events. Such is the honesty, frankness, and transparency of the writer that this is not a difficult task.

The most striking feature of the autobiography from a historical point of view is the prominence of the author's political preferences. Senator Hoar is a consistent individualistic liberal of the old school, a firm believer in the dignity of human nature and the rights of man. Standing squarely on the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, he maintains the justice and essential wisdom of the Reconstruction measures with the same earnestness as that shown in his opposition to the forcible annexation of the Philippines. By these principles he judges men, measures, and parties, and only through their application does he expect to see present difficulties solved. He says:

We should have had little difficulty in dealing with the Negro or the Indian, or the Oriental, if the American people had applied to them, as the Golden Rule requires, the principles they expect to apply and to have applied to themselves. We have never understood that in some essential matters human nature is the same in men of all colors and races. Our Fathers of the time of the Revolution understood this matter better than we do (I. 259).

Holding to this view, it is impossible that Senator Hoar should sympathize with or even comprehend a Southern man or an imperialist. Practical difficulties he admits; he is willing to concede that "a large number of the men who got political office in the South, when . . . the Republicans were still in power, were of a character that would not have been tolerated in public office in the North" (II. 161), and that the Filipinos are "just coming out of barbarism", but these in his mind count as nothing before the demands of human equality and human rights.

Senator Hoar has in addition to these principles an almost religious belief in the past and present merits of the Republican party, and repeatedly takes occasion to define his position. He is not a partizan

from prejudice, he says, but as the result of "as cool, calculating, sober and deliberate reflection as I am able to give to any question of conduct or duty". Accordingly he "believes with all his heart and soul in the principles of the Republican party", and such being the case, nothing will induce him to leave it. It is true, he admits, that there was great corruption under Grant, but adds :

It never occurred to me that these abuses furnished any reason for placing the powers of the Government in the hands of the Southern Democracy, or their ally, Tammany Hall. If the men who saved the Union were not to be trusted to keep it pure ; if the men who abolished slavery could not carry on a Government in freedom and in honor, certainly it was not likely that the men of Tammany Hall, or the men who had so lately attempted to overthrow the Government, would do it any better (I. 309).

An additional reason in his opinion for adhering to the Republican party is that it contains most of the good men of the country, while the Democratic party contains most of the others. Nothing could be more explicit than this :

The Republican Party, whatever its faults, since it came into power in 1860 has been composed in general of what is best in our national life. . . . On the other hand their antagonist has been, is, and for an indefinite time to come will be, controlled by the foreign population and the criminal classes of our great cities, by Tammany Hall, and by the leaders of the solid South (I. 200).

Writing, then, as an honest partizan, frankly biased on events not within the limits of the Republican party, Mr. Hoar contributes a mass of anecdote, political and personal. In the Reconstruction period and more recently he frankly admits the party's defects and mistakes, but he describes nothing novel beyond some personal incidents. Evidently Senator Hoar's own philosophy of history is Carlylesque. He is especially fond of showing the dependence of a chain of important events upon the error of some one man or the choice of some small group. Since history appears so largely an affair of persons in Senator Hoar's eyes, his attitude toward persons becomes of importance ; and here we find him a man of great kindness, optimism, and generosity — toward Republicans. He endeavors to see the good side of people, to give men their due, and when he feels himself biased in any one's disfavor, he usually makes a frank admission of the fact. For the men he wholly likes he cherishes an unstinted admiration and upon them he pours out superlative eulogy. Yet Mr. Hoar's judgments, while highly optimistic, are by no means wholly indiscriminating ; his heroes are not all perfect, and in his descriptions of their weak points he often shows a pen keen as well as humorous. What wins him is evidently personal warmth and kindness. Even Democrats, Southern fire-eaters, whose principles were utterly abhorrent, receive kindly notice from this reason in several cases.

On the other hand, the man of bitter tongue, brusqueness, or intolerance is either ignored or treated with scant patience. Over President Harrison's lack of urbanity the author laments with constantly recurring

regret that so worthy a man — and a Republican at that — should be so lacking in tact. The few men whom Senator Hoar clearly dislikes are almost all men of sharp speech, such as Conkling, Ingalls, Butler, Wendell Phillips, and Tillman. Democrats in general Mr. Hoar passes over with slight mention, if we except the few Southerners he found attractive. To one group of men, however, the author never fails to refer with contempt and asperity — the independents. "It is said that no man is a hero to his valet", he remarks (I. 313). "The reason is . . . that the valet cannot see anything that is great and noble, but only what is mean and base. The history of no people is heroic to its Mugwumps." Elsewhere he says: "They have commonly discussed the profoundest and subtlest questions with an angry and bitter personality which finds its parallel only in the theological treatises of the dark ages. It is lucky for some of us that they have not had the fires of Smithfield or of the Inquisition at their command." Still again he speaks of the independent newspapers, who "welcomed any opportunity to support their theory that American public life was rotten and corrupt". One cannot help feeling that since the principles of most of the mugwumps are identical with those of Mr. Hoar, the antagonism felt between them reduces itself largely to a question of manners.

A few statements of fact deserve discussion. The assertion (I. 145) that "the Free Soil Party derived its chief strength . . . of numbers . . . from the Whigs" seems questionable when the votes are studied. Unless we are to suppose a great migration of Democrats to the Whig ticket in 1848, at least two-thirds of the new party must have been drawn from the Liberty and Democratic ranks. Again, in saying that "the Liberty Party . . . was willing to support the candidates of other parties who were personally unobjectionable", whereas "the Free Soil Party . . . determined that no person should receive its support for any national office who himself continued his association with either of the old political organizations", an entirely false impression is created. In fact, the Liberty party adhered rigidly to its own candidates, while the Free-soil party made more coalitions than any other third party before the days of the Populists. In the same volume, page 285, Chase is represented as being mainly responsible for the issue of legal tenders in 1862, and as their original advocate; but Chase's latest biographer makes it clear that he took the step with great reluctance and only in response to Congressional pressure. In the second volume, in discussing the Reconstruction period, Mr. Hoar says, page 162, "Suffrage was conferred upon the negro by the Southern States themselves"; but while this is technically true, the method of its conferring under the terms of the Reconstruction acts scarcely left it a voluntary process. It is in such statements as this that Mr. Hoar's unconscious partizanship becomes evident, but its most surprising result is seen in the twice repeated assertion that in "the first sixteen years of the Government, which included the Administrations of Washington and John Adams and the first term of Jefferson . . . there was not only more corruption in proportion than there had

been under Grant, but there had been more in amount, notwithstanding the difference in population" (I. 309). That the handful of office-holders, transacting the modest finances of a small nation under such men as Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, should have been thought capable of exceeding in amount the corruption of the Reconstruction administrations in a time of general inflation, indebtedness, and speculation is almost unthinkable, and cannot be taken seriously. The context shows that Mr. Hoar's opinion was formed as the result of some study undertaken during the Belknap episode in Grant's second term for the purpose of defending the administration. What was then said as a plea in mitigation for the Republican party is now repeated as though it were ascertained history.

Perhaps the kernel of the work lies in the author's summary of his own contribution to recent history, in places where he claims to have exercised decisive influence. Among such are his suggestion of several appointments to Presidents Hayes, Harrison, and McKinley, his membership of the Electoral Commission of 1877, his share in the nomination of Garfield in 1880, and the authorship of some important bills. He maintains that whenever he has differed from his party in any policy, he has been justified by the event. "In every single instance unless the question of the Philippine Islands shall prove an exception . . . the party has come round, in the end, to my way of thinking."

But the permanent value of the volumes, apart from their wealth of anecdotal and personal material, will be in the picture of the career of a conscientious public servant, who could truly say that his life was spent in unselfish legislative duties, which brought neither riches nor inordinate power. "I think I may fairly claim", he modestly says, "that I have done my share of the work of the Senate and of the House to the best of my ability. Senator Edmunds when he left the Senate was kind enough to compliment me by saying that the whole work of the Senate was done by six men, of whom I was one." That this opinion is no great exaggeration appears when one studies the chapter where Mr. Hoar's lifelong committee service is described. He is a true type of the older statesman, the liberal Puritan, if the term be not a solecism, of the early nineteenth century, a type now fast disappearing. How many of our leading senators could say as does Senator Hoar, "I have never lifted my finger or spoken a word to any man to secure or to promote my own election to any office"?

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Dochet (St. Croix) Island: a Monograph. By W. F. GANONG, M.A., Ph.D. (Ottawa: J. Hope and Sons; Toronto: The Copp-Clark Company; London: Bernard Quaritch. 1902. Pp. 127-231.)

THIS is the separate issue which really appeared in the summer of 1903, and is to form a part of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of*

Canada, second series, 1902-1903, in Section IV. of Volume VIII. Although presented to the Royal Society on May 27, 1902, its late publication is due to unnecessary delay by the printer.

Dr. Ganong, who is a native of St. Stephen, New Brunswick, has been familiar with this island and its surroundings from early boyhood, and it has occupied a considerable place in his studies for many years, particularly in connection with his *Monograph of the Evolution of the Boundaries of the Province of New Brunswick*, published in the seventh volume, second series, of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* (see the REVIEW, VIII. 364). The object of this study is "to set forth, as accurately, fully, and clearly" as possible "all that is known of the history of this island". To this end Dr. Ganong writes about the island's geography, geology, and natural history; explains its changing nomenclature; records the principal maps which bear upon its cartography; and defines the literature and records from which its place in history may be ascertained. He has divided the history into four periods. Sieur de Monts, accompanied by Champlain, discovered the island in 1604 and began a settlement there. The first period relates to this settlement and to events as far as the grant of Razilly in 1632. Three original works are the sole sources for the greater part of this period, and all subsequent writers have had recourse to them for their facts. Dr. Ganong gives full extracts of their original French texts with translations, liberally annotated. They are Champlain's *Voyages* (1613), Lescarbot's *Histoire* (1612), and *Le Mercure François* for 1608 (printed in 1611). The second period deals with the island's important relation to the northeastern boundary controversies, and in the determination of the River St. Croix as the international boundary between the present province of New Brunswick and the United States, 1796-1799. In this section Dr. Ganong prints a number of important documents from manuscripts in private hands, and his analysis of the island as a bone of contention (its name at the time, curiously enough, was Bone Island) is of the highest importance for the history of our international boundaries. The third period explains its modern history from the first permanent settlement of the St. Croix to the year 1902, and the last consideration is given to the probable and desirable future of the island.

Dochet (pronounced locally Doshay) Island is situated in the River St. Croix, at about where the river empties into Passamaquoddy Bay, in latitude $45^{\circ} 07' 44''$, and longitude $67^{\circ} 08' 03''$. It has without doubt the distinction of being one of the smallest islands that ever figured in a great international dispute, for it "was the chief determinant in fixing the St. Croix as the international boundary". It is now occupied solely by one of the United States light stations, consisting of a house with a revolving flash-light, and various lesser buildings belonging to the station, together with a small shed used by weir fishermen. Yet concerning this seemingly unimportant place of to-day Dr. Ganong has succeeded in bringing together a mass of historical data sufficient to make a monograph of about one hundred closely printed octavo pages, appropriately illus-

trated, and enhanced by a new survey. The results are a credit to the author and a boon to the historical student. Moreover, the appearance of this study is very timely, since the three-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the island occurs this year, and Dr. Ganong fittingly suggests that the occasion be commemorated with dignified and appropriate ceremonies; that the island be dedicated "to the free use of the people forever", and that a graceful monument, recording the events and commemorating the persons prominent in its history, be erected there by the historical societies of Maine and New Brunswick.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

The twenty-fifth revised edition, recently brought out at Leipzig, of Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas*, is now offered by Lemcke and Buechner (New York, 1902), with an English rendering of the introduction and explanatory notes, and a German-English glossary and index of names. Many additional maps are furnished, without expanding the bulk of the book, by utilizing the backs of the maps included in previous editions. The only noticeable change in former maps is in the color-scheme used, but this in itself constitutes a great improvement, for in general the same color is used for a state or country throughout the series devoted to a period, whereas in former editions no such rule was followed, and the result was often confusing. The translation of the explanatory notes accompanying the work, but not bound with it, makes the work itself more easily useful to young students, but as much cannot be said of the glossary of German-English names, since in the alphabetical arrangement the German names have been placed first, followed by their English equivalents. The principal usefulness of the atlas for students who do not read German is in the ready location of places noted in English historical readings, and for this reason the English names should have preceded the German in the glossary.

J. B. Bury's edition of Edward A. Freeman's *Historical Geography of Europe* (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. lii, 611) contains little new matter; the work is practically what it was in the two editions issued over twenty years ago under the care of the author himself. Indeed, as Professor Bury suggests, it is a work that should never need many changes; with a few brief additions from time to time, it may be "as fresh and as useful to students a hundred years hence as it is to-day". Accordingly, in the way of changes for this third edition, he has considered it sufficient to notice at the appropriate places the few shiftings in European political geography since 1881; to modify, omit, or add some foot-notes; and to correct occasional trifling errors. He even leaves undisturbed, save by an editorial caution, the section on "Geographical Distribution of Races", in which Mr. Freeman's well-known use of the term Aryan is especially displayed. The maps illustrating the text, which were first published as Volume II., appear separately now as then, but also as a distinct work, with a title of its own: *Atlas to the Historical Geography of Europe*.

E. W. Dow.

The Study of Ecclesiastical History. By William Edward Collins, B.D. [Handbooks for the Clergy, edited by Arthur W. Robinson, B.D.] (London, New York, and Bombay, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. xvi, 166.) This is an unpretentious handbook on historical method, by the professor of ecclesiastical history at King's College, London, author of *The English Reformation and its Consequences* (1901), and contributor to the second volume of *The Cambridge Modern History*. The book is superfluous for those who know their Bernheim, but will no doubt be found useful by English college students and young clergymen, for whom especially it was written. Mr. Collins insists upon adherence to the "scientific" method as a prerequisite for studying the history of the church, as well as other history. *Ceteris paribus*, "the best historical student will make the best ecclesiastical historian" (p. 12), yet to study the church most profitably, one must sympathetically view its history "as centered in the faith of Christ", which the life of the church sums up (p. 6).

There are two chapters on historical method in general, based largely upon Langlois and Seignobos, and four of elementary advice and suggestion, relating more particularly to the church itself. The book concludes with a short and roughly classified bibliography of some 300 titles, giving preference to those in English. The omission of an index is hardly serious. The *Translations and Reprints* mentioned on page 109 are published by the University of Pennsylvania, not by Columbia. Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole* is ascribed to the wrong editor (p. 147), and by some blunder Harnack's *Ausbreitung des Christentums* appears among the works on canon law (p. 148).

J. W. PLATNER.

Dr. Edmund von Mach's *Greek Sculpture: its Spirit and Principles* (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1903, pp. xviii, 359) "is addressed to all students of art, to executing artists, and to the general public", and is not without its interest for teachers and students of Greek culture-history. The book is divided into two parts. Part I. deals with general characteristics and principles: Part II. is a history of the development of the various forms of sculpture, in the round and in relief, illustrated by descriptive discussions of the more famous examples. Excepting the fragmentary and vague introductory chapters on general principles, the exposition is clear, readable, and not too technical, and, in consequence, is well adapted for the intelligent layman. The most important contribution for the special student is the discussion, Part I., Chapters V.-VIII., of the principles of relief sculpture. A few of the author's statements on points of general history are erroneous or misleading. The photographic reproductions scattered throughout the text, as well as the group of forty plates at the end of the volume, add much to the value and attractiveness of the work.

In Greek Votive Offerings: an Essay in the History of Greek Religion (Cambridge, University Press; New York, The Macmillan Com-

pany, 1902, pp. xv, 463), Mr. W. H. D. Rouse has brought together the accumulations of ten years of diligent and learned research. Understanding a votive offering to be, strictly speaking, "whatever is given of freewill to a being conceived as superhuman", the main purpose of his book "is to collect and classify those offerings which are not immediately perishable; and by examining the occasion of their dedication, and the statements made about it, to trace if possible the motives of the dedicant and the meaning which the act had for him." Beginning with the worship of the dead and the chthonian deities, the author passes next to consider tithes and first-fruits, devoting the remainder, and greater part of the treatise to important occasions for the dedication of votive offerings. His conclusions are in the main conservative. Since Mr. Rouse is the first modern writer dealing with the subject as a whole, the work should be of great value as a work of reference to the student of Greek antiquities; but the method of arrangement and the array of facts would keep any one else at a respectful distance.

A. L. C.

That vast undertaking, *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*, is making such steady progress that it seems not unlikely that the hundred and sixty volumes of the history proper, and, possibly, the forty supplementary volumes of genealogies of leading county families may be completed within the eight years specified by the projectors of the series. Since, at the present writing, only the initial volume on any one county has appeared, it is not yet possible to form more than a tentative estimate of the value of the work from the scholar's point of view. Certainly every safeguard has been taken to insure thoroughness and accuracy. The advisory council having supervision over the whole includes a list of men each of recognized authority in his particular field. In addition a body of "sectional editors" are coöperating with local investigators in various departments, while still another committee of experts is directing the search of records. The names of the late Lord Acton, of Sir Frederick Pollock, and Messrs. F. York Powell, Round, Tout, Tait, Stevenson, and Firth, on one or another of these groups promises well for the strictly historical side of the enterprise.

Following those on Hampshire and Norfolk, the two volumes now before us (Westminster: A. Constable and Company, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company) form in each case the first of a series of four on Worcestershire and Surrey. Mr. J. W. Willis-Bund edits the former, Mr. H. E. Malden the latter. In both about half the space is devoted to natural features, while the remaining chapters are of more special interest to historical students. For Worcestershire "Early Man", "Romano-British Remains", "Anglo-Saxon Remains"; and the Domesday Survey are treated by B. C. A. Windle, F. Haverfield, Reginald A. Smith, and J. Horace Round respectively; in the Surrey volume "Early Man" is by George Clinch, "Anglo-Saxon Remains" by Reginald A. Smith, and the "Introduction to the Surrey Domesday" by Mr. Round.

The editor furnishes the text of the Domesday Survey and a chapter on the political history of the county up to the present time. An essay on Romano-British remains is to follow. For historians one of the most valuable portions thus far issued is Mr. Round's admirable series of studies on the local details of the Domesday Survey, supplementing as it does the recent investigations of Maitland and others in a thorny territory. A pedigree of the Knightley families of Fawsley, Northampton, edited by Messrs. Oswald Barron and W. Ryland D. Adkins, furnishes a specimen of the exhaustive and painstaking fashion with which the genealogy is to be treated. The external features of the work as a whole deserve high praise: paper, printing, binding, and, above all, the innumerable illustrations, maps, and plates display the nicest taste and finish of execution. Unfortunately the bulk and expense of the complete set will place it beyond the reach of most; but the volumes on each county are sold separately, and from the list of subscribers it is evident that the whole work will be accessible in many American libraries.

A. L. CROSS.

Dr. Theodor Lindner, in the first two volumes of his history of the world since the Germanic migrations, covered both much space and much time, since he dealt with peoples of Asia as well as of Europe and carried the narrative from the decline of Rome to the thirteenth century. But having thus reached a period when the facts to be considered increased alike in extent and interest, he treats in the third volume only of Europe, and besides only of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and earlier fifteenth centuries (*Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung*. In neun Bänden. Dritter Band. Stuttgart and Berlin, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, pp. x, 592). Within this relatively restricted field he has a twofold aim: first, to describe that civilization which had gradually developed in western Europe under the guidance of the Christian church; and then, to show how out of the régime where this civilization, with its church-maintained unity, prevailed, disintegration inevitably came forth. The rise of commerce and industry, with their accompanying money-power, enabled folk, that had hitherto only toiled, to gain civil and political rights, especially through organizations in the towns; states also grew strong, and national developments began. Thus laymen gradually freed themselves from ecclesiastical tutelage. They begot another way of viewing the world, and eventually their way prevailed. The story of how it prevailed is long; only a part of it is told in Dr. Lindner's third volume, the part concerning the fall of the political power of the popes. The heads of the church lost ground especially in the struggles with the king in France and the emperor in Germany; also in the sad period of the great schism; and their victory over the councils reestablished them ecclesiastically rather than politically. The rest of the story runs on into the seventeenth century, and will be told in the next two volumes. This third volume, like its predecessors, is accompanied by selected bibliographies and an index of persons and places. Like its predecessors, also,

it reads easily, and, besides its cyclopedic value, has that kind of merit which may appear when a subject of so many parts and so diverse connections is treated by a single writer.

E. W. Dow.

Mediæval and Modern History. By Philip Van Ness Myers. Part II. *The Modern Age.* (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1903, pp. viii, 650.) This revision of the second part of the author's *Mediæval and Modern History* is perhaps even more successful than that of the first part recently appearing under the title *The Middle Ages*. The characteristic changes are the same: the addition of much new matter (the new book being nearly twice as long as the old second part), many changes of emphasis and corrections of small errors, and the insertion at the end of each chapter of very considerable bibliographies, both of source-material and secondary works. While many of these are so extensive as to bewilder the high-school pupil, they can be of great service in the hands of a thoroughly competent teacher, and for their own reference college teachers as well as high-school teachers may make considerable use of these very conscientiously and ably chosen lists.

The good points of the book are many; one feels that there are few really important conclusions reached by scholars of history that are not to be found here. Never taking too much knowledge for granted, it is sane, even, understandable, and interesting. It is distinctly narrative and objective. Of the new parts, written always in a more scholarly tone and as if designed for a somewhat older audience, Chapters VII., XII., and XXIV., on the divine right doctrine, eighteenth-century England, and late European expansion, are especially good.

One may justly criticize devoting six of the thirteen pages on Elizabeth to Mary Stuart and the Armada, or relegating to a foot-note all mention of cabinet government; also it may seem to lower the tone of a history to quote dying words seventeen times or to tell how many strokes of the ax sufficed to cut off Mary Stuart's head. But the well-known faults of the author which these things illustrate are much less apparent in his later work.

A. B. WHITE.

Les Publicistes de la Réforme sous François II et Charles IX, par Paul F. -M. Méaly. (Paris, Fischbacher, 1903, pp. 270.) The origin of the political ideas of the Revolution is at present one of the subjects of the day. The most generally accepted view, which gives the credit of it to the philosophers of the eighteenth century alone, is more and more being overthrown by the historians, and the time is not far distant when recognition will be given the publicists of the sixteenth century for the part which is theirs in the building of the modern state.

M. Méaly's volume is a valuable contribution to the study of the political literature of the French Reformation. The author has assumed the task of exploiting the lampoons which were produced just after the

religious schisms during the troubled reigns of the last of the Valois, and has fulfilled it with entire success. His study, well written, replete with excerpts and documents of prime value, forms a book which can be recommended to the general public as well as to the specialists. The latter will have but one criticism to offer, but that is of a fundamental character. The author is too limited in his study of French sources, not only those belonging to the period which he has studied, but also those appearing in publications of our own times. Two tyrannies in particular in the sixteenth century called forth the indignant protest of the reformers and the appeal by them from royal to popular sovereignty: that of Bloody Mary in England, and that of Charles IX. in France. The protestation of Mary's victims, refugees upon the continent, preceded that of the Huguenots. The latter heard the outcry and profited thereby. This fact of first importance should have been taken into account other than by a brief foot-note on John Knox. In regard to the works of our own time, I will confine myself, in order not to exceed the space at my disposal, to reminding M. Méaly of L. Ehinger, the latest biographer of the author of the *Franco-Gallia*, who published at Basel in 1892 a life of Franz Hotman, wherein might have been found many useful suggestions as to the career and character of the professor-publicist of Geneva.

CHARLES BORGEAUD.

The tenth volume of *The Camden Miscellany* (London, Royal Historical Society, 1902, pp. xxi, 139, xxiv, 144, 21) contains "The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests, for the years 1593-1616, together with Notes in another Hand, for the Years 1642-1649", edited by Harold Spencer Scott; "A Book of the Travaile and Lief of Me, Thomas Hoby, wth Diverse Things woorth the Notinge", edited by Edgar Powell; and "Prince Rupert at Lisbon", edited by the late S. R. Gardiner. About one-half of Wilbraham's *Journal* is printed, while the omitted passages, dealing mainly with literary and legal matters, are briefly described in the table of contents. His entries concerning English affairs deal with prorogations and dissolutions of Parliament, with speeches of the sovereign and ministers, with debates in Parliament and discussions in the Privy Council. Sir Thomas Hoby (1530-1566) is chiefly known to modern scholars as the translator of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*. The autobiography here printed covers the period from 1547 to 1564 and has to do mainly with his travels on the continent. The writer's opportunities were exceptional, from the fact that his elder brother, Sir Philip, was for many years ambassador to the court of Emperor Charles V. The papers relating to Prince Rupert's coming to Lisbon with the king's fleet in 1649-1650 consist of a narrative and accompanying letters, which are chiefly significant as proving that King John IV. of Portugal deliberately planned to support Rupert against the Commonwealth, and to give him the liberty and protection of his ports.

A. L. C.

The Regency of Marie de Médicis, 1610 to 1616. By Arthur Power Lord, Ph.D. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1903, pp. x, 180.) The work is described by its author as a study of French history from 1610 to 1616. Presumably it is a postgraduate thesis, and as such it is entitled to credit. Mr. Lord has examined the records and memoirs of the period, and his work is based upon proper historical material. It is fairly accurate in the account of the intrigues and plottings of the great nobles during the minority of Louis XIII. All this is commendable and shows care, industry, and correct methods of study.

How valuable the book may be to readers is another question. The work itself is of value to the man who does it, and that is much. Any historical study which is accurate, the result of honest and industrious examination of the events of some period in the past, has a sufficient *raison d'être*, and justifies its own existence. The notion that no book should be published unless it adds largely to the sum of human knowledge or possesses literary qualities of a high degree is nonsense. There is no more reason for requiring inspiration in a number of pages bound together as an octavo than in a number of pages fastened together as the Sunday edition of a New York newspaper.

If one were to be critical, he could suggest that the plots and counter-plots of Condé and his associates, to an account of which this work is devoted, do not deserve the space given them. They were the obscure intrigues of men who in the course of three centuries have themselves become obscure. Some lessons as to the character of the French nobility and the French government might be drawn, but Mr. Lord has not endeavored to draw them. Indeed, the abundance of minor detail makes it difficult to obtain a satisfactory view of the general situation. We doubt if a person not familiar with the period would have a clear idea, even of its political ups and downs, after reading this book. The event of most importance was the meeting of the States-General in 1614, but neither as to the general character of the body, nor as to its particular working at this session, would the reader obtain any valuable information.

There are occasional errors in the work. Mr. Lord says at page 90, speaking of the sale of judicial offices, "the Nobles, always poor, had no money to pay out when the offices were put on the market". This is a very inaccurate generalization. Some nobles were poor and many were rich; it was not because they had no money that they did not fill judicial office. Again, at page 92 he says, "The pensions of the Nobility were another invention of the great Henry", etc. Surely Mr. Lord does not think that granting pensions to members of the nobility began with Henry IV. Such slips probably indicate carelessness, otherwise they would betray a very superficial knowledge of French history.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

Mazarin, by Arthur Hassall, M.A. (New York, The Macmillan Company; London, Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1903, pp. xv, 187),

is one of the recent volumes in the "Foreign Statesmen" series, edited by J. B. Bury. It is based mainly on Chéruef's two well-known volumes, and therefore adopts that author's rather rosy view of Richelieu's successor. In fact, Mr. Hassall seems to have been at pains to justify Mazarin's right to a place beside Charlemagne, Philip Augustus, Mirabeau, and the other foreign statesmen. "As a foreign politician and diplomatist Mazarin has had few equals among French statesmen, and he deserves full credit for his great diplomatic triumphs. . . . On his death Mazarin left France in a stronger position than she had enjoyed at any previous period in her history. Industrious, patient, subtle and adroit, Mazarin proved to be one of the most sagacious and successful statesmen in French history. He was essentially a diplomatist, and his greatest triumphs were triumphs of diplomacy" (p. ix). This assertion is several times repeated throughout the book, and it does in fact contain much truth, but the proof of its truth is scarcely to be gathered from Mr. Hassall's narrative. Mazarin's troubles in the early part of his rule he believes to have been due, not to his own character, unpopularity, and incapacity, but to the fact that he embodied the continuance and development of Richelieu's policy. Richelieu had abused the feudal and legal aristocracy by exile and execution; he had entered a foreign war and left the finances in a ruinous condition. In so doing he had sown the wind, and Mazarin reaped the whirlwind. In this also there is much truth, and we should gladly see some lucid analysis of the actual state of affairs in 1643 that would make us realize this truth by giving us a real grasp of the problems that Mazarin had to face. This Mr. Hassall has completely failed to give.

Of Mr. Hassall's style it is difficult to speak with patience. Sentences which have different subjects and different verbs and have no close connection with each other are continually coördinated with bewildering ands and buts and howevers. Endless names, dates, and unimportant details, without any underlying guiding idea to lend them significance, are forced upon the reader. Finally, as though in the body of the volume he had not already furnished names and dates *ad nauseam*, Mr. Hassall adds a list of them at the end. Be it said that they are mostly very accurate. But such a book as this ought to be a readable biography and not a Ploetz's *Epitome*. There is no index.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Old Quebec, the Fortress of New France. By Sir Gilbert Parker and Claude G. Bryan. (New York, The Macmillan Company; London, Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1903, pp. xxiv, 486.) The volume begins at the beginning of Canada, traces the eventful story of Quebec, and concludes with a chapter on the modern period, which brings the reader to the present day. It was doubtless the literary interest of the subject which invited the authors' attention to it, and one hardly need say that from the literary point of view the work is to be commended. It will provide many a general reader with both information and entertainment.

The historical student will, however, not only miss many things that a thorough history of Quebec might be expected to give, but will discover errors. For example: it is stated (p. 341) that the Quebec Act "held the French fast to their allegiance"; but Hey, chief-justice of Quebec, wrote the Lord Chancellor, August 28, 1775 (MS., Canadian Archives, Q, 12, page 203), "an Act passed for the express purpose of gratifying the Canadians . . . is become the first object of their discontent and dislike". It was in fact relished by only the small minority belonging to the upper classes; and Carleton informed the Earl of Dartmouth, November 5, 1775 (MS., S.P.O., Amer. and Ind., Vol. 327), "The Canadian Peasantry not only deserted their duty, but numbers of them have taken arms against the Crown." It was not Richard Montgomery, but his brother Alexander, who served under Wolfe at the siege of Quebec (p. 342). Montgomery did not capture Ticonderoga and Crown Point (p. 343). Carleton did not paddle to Quebec in a canoe (*ibid.*). It is not correct to say (*ibid.*) that "Citizens suspected of disaffection were banished" from Quebec, for Carleton's proclamation of November 22 ordered out of town only those — with their families — who would not take up arms. Arnold's expedition did not cross New Hampshire (p. 344). It did not go overland "from Boston to Point Lévi" (p. 347), for about a third of the distance was traversed in sailing vessels. Montgomery did not erect batteries on the St. Charles and at Point Lévi (p. 349). It is not true that he saw but one promising way of attacking Quebec (p. 351), for he had two plans, and the one he executed, though he deemed it "promising", was his second choice.

The book is fully illustrated; a considerable number of the pictures are finely engraved portraits. The sources of only a few are given, and the best originals have not been selected in all cases. Five useful maps and plans are presented. The index makes only seven pages.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Governor William Tryon, and his Administration in the Province of North Carolina, 1765-1771. By Marshall DeLancey Haywood. (Raleigh, N. C., A. Williams and Co, 1903, pp. 223.) This work, as the title suggests, covers a short period, and is almost wholly local in its point of view. It nevertheless is of much interest and value, though its statement is at times very disconnected. It could not, strictly speaking, be called a history of the administration of Governor Tryon; it is much more biographical and genealogical than historical. And when it deals with the purely historical, it does so in a narrative way. At no time does the author analyze and discuss the underlying forces of the years with which he is dealing. There is no mention or discussion of the territorial, fiscal, and judicial systems of the province, and no statement concerning the general position of the governor, council, or lower house of the legislature. To make the picture of Governor Tryon and his administration at all complete, it would be necessary to add a statement of these to what Mr. Haywood has said. Nor has the author made any

mention of what was the relation of the colonists to the crown of England; and this to the mind of the reviewer is a serious defect. When, for instance, we read Mr. Haywood's narration of the Stamp Act troubles in North Carolina, we feel that the author has not found the key to the situation, or at least that he has not shown it to the reader. It should, however, be stated that Mr. Haywood did not intend to look for the key; his purpose was to tell what had happened during Tryon's administration, not to analyze these happenings.

Though the work is only a narration, the author has rendered a good service to historical scholarship. His picture of Governor Tryon is much more in accord with the facts in the case than the picture which has hitherto been given of this picturesque colonial official. He has also added much to our information concerning many of the prominent colonists. His narration of the "Regulator" troubles, while to some extent partizan, has much of interest and value.

After speaking of the genealogy of Governor Tryon and of his becoming the chief magistrate of the province of North Carolina, Mr. Haywood takes up the chief events of his administration. He tells us of Tryon's tolerance in religion and of his advocacy of education among the colonists. He states the positions of the governor and of the planters of the lower Cape Fear section on the Stamp Act and the operation of the act in North Carolina, here and there digressing to give a biographical sketch of the chief leaders. The latter half of the book is devoted to the Regulator troubles. His narration of these is fairly full and interesting. He accepts Professor Bassett's view that the Regulator war was not a revolution but only a peasants' uprising, not a rebellion against the royal government, but against the local administration of the finances and justice. Perhaps the most important feature of his statement of this struggle is the fact that he has brought some of its leaders into a new light, out of the darkness into which many of the popular historians had cast them; and this is a valuable service, though the author himself is to an extent partizan in his position.

CHARLES LEE RAPER.

Anthony Wayne. By John R. Spears. [Series of Historic Lives.] (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1903, pp. iv, 249.) This volume has been written in most painstaking fashion. The author firmly believes that, in spite of medals and banquets, Wayne was never appreciated fully; but that less competent and less deserving men were preferred to him. Even Washington, who certainly had the most ample opportunity for knowledge of Wayne's capabilities, hesitated to place him in charge of the army raised to subdue the Lake Indians after the defeats of Harmar and St. Clair, because, as the President put it, Wayne was "more active and enterprising than judicious and cautious. No economist, it is feared. Open to flattery, vain; easily imposed upon and liable to be drawn into scrapes". One could wish that Mr. Spears, taking this deliberate opinion of Washington's, had worked out the thesis. Then this

would have been the biography of a man of flesh and blood — a dashing, daring, fighting soldier, who repeatedly won success by audacity. With certain obvious limitations to the analogy, Wayne belongs to the same class with Sheridan and Sherman — to the class of great lieutenants and popular heroes. Mr. Spears, however, has preferred to make Wayne a hero by the arithmetical process; and the pages of the book fairly bristle with figures to show how often vastly superior numbers of the enemy were overcome or disconcerted by Mad Anthony's audacious attacks. As a result the reader is ever under the strain of not being able to believe that Wayne was quite as successful as the author thinks he was; and thus the reading becomes fatiguing. In his last campaign Wayne certainly won a great success, for which he had made careful preparation. After the Revolution St. Clair, Harmar, William Hull, and George Rogers Clark all lost the reputations they had won; but in Wayne's case neither his storming of Stony Point nor his nipping in the bud the mutiny in the Pennsylvania line can compare with the service he performed in subduing the Indians of the northwest, thus preparing the way for the surrender of the posts retained by the British. And right here we have an example of how slowly history climbs the Alleghenies; for Mr. Spears seems never to have thought it worth his while to inquire into the causes which led the British commanders in Canada to take so bold a stand against the boundary provisions of the treaty of 1783. Nor is the faintest glimmer of light thrown on the still unsettled questions of chronology connected with the American possession of the northwest. In short, Mr. Spears, with all his labor, has prepared a compilation of facts rather than a contribution to history.

CHARLES MOORE.

Eighty Years of Union. By James Schouler, LL.D. (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1903, pp. xiv, 416.) This volume consists of extracts from the author's well-known *History of the United States*. Both from its subtitle (*Being a Short History of the United States, 1783-1865*) and its professed model (Edgar's condensation of Parkman, *The Struggle for a Continent*) it lays claim to consideration as being something more than a mere collection of valuable extracts. Whether the claim is valid must depend principally upon the character of the editorial work bestowed upon the volume.

In selecting his extracts the editor has certainly picked out the passages that would best bear transplanting; yet it is a fair criticism that upon this test the claim made for the volume is not altogether vindicated. Rather more than a fourth of the space is devoted to characterizations of important personages. Where so large a matter is to be condensed into so small a compass this is disproportionate. Only very little space is allowed for the description of social and political conditions, and in consequence the narrative of events proceeds without sufficient background for intelligent comprehension. The method of the volume makes necessary the omission of many important events, but excellent judgment

has been shown in the selection of those to be included. The most serious single defect of the book is the manner in which the materials are put together. In the volume which served as model, numerous bracketed paragraphs connect the extracts and thus produce the effect of a continuous and fairly comprehensive narrative. Here there is nothing of the kind nor any equivalent. With many of the extracts a slight alteration of the opening sentence would have done much to secure the desired unity, but even this seems not to have been done, save in a single instance. The omission is doubly unfortunate, as it robs the book of much of the interest which it might have possessed and contributes to the invalidation of its principal claim for consideration. Regarded as a collection of extracts, the volume has much merit. The admirable pen-portraits and other attractive features will doubtless stimulate many to read the more ample accounts in the *History*. Yet there are serious defects. The plan of adhering strictly to the text of the *History* has made necessary many elisions in the passages selected for reproduction. That these elisions are not indicated is perhaps pardonable in a book intended principally for the casual reader, but even in such a book three-fifths of the space devoted to the Jay treaty should not be given to Fisher Ames's speech, the account of the Monroe doctrine should not begin with the arrival of Rush's despatches at Washington, and the story of Jefferson's election to the presidency should not terminate with the counting of the ballot of the electoral college. There are few notes, perhaps twenty in all. Not more than six or seven of these are new, although the text contains many allusions to the omitted passages and hence often needs some explanation. The remainder are about equally divided between elucidations and citations of authorities, both most capriciously chosen. In the text there are no subtitles within the chapters, the apparent intent being that the numerous blank spaces should serve as equivalents. These, however, are inserted in most bewildering fashion. They do not correspond with the table of contents, are not in accordance with the spacing in the *History*, and often occur in the very midst of a topic.

FRANK MALOV ANDERSON.

History of Coinage and Currency in the United States and the Perennial Contest for Sound Money. By A. Barton Hepburn, LL.D. (New York, The Macmillan Company; London, Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1903, pp. xiv, 666). Of all the parts of the economic history of the United States none has been more fully or more successfully studied than the financial history of our country. And of this section none has received more attention from American scholars than the history of American money. There would seem little room for another "History of Coins and Currency" in the long list of scholarly treatises on that subject, at least not until some new movement in our monetary legislation or a genuine reform of the national banking system offers new material to the investigator.

The book before us has this advantage over similar ones that have preceded it. It is written by one who for many years has been active in the financial world, first as superintendent of the New York state banking department, then as bank examiner and comptroller of the currency in the federal government, and during the past ten years as a leading official in prominent New York banks. His wide experience gives him a practical insight into the workings of the currency and banking systems of the country which no amount of scientific investigation can equal. His identification with the second Cleveland administration and its aims in monetary and currency legislation makes him, of course, a strong advocate of the measures which, for the time being, have put the silver agitation to rest. In his treatment of that agitation, which, as the title of the book indicates, forms one of its central points, some may object to the spirit of partizanship he displays. We are perhaps still too near to that "contest for sound money" reasonably to expect a perfectly dispassionate treatment of the great movement.

With this qualification, the book deserves high commendation for its successful treatment of the dramatic story of the successive cheap-money movements culminating in the passage of the Currency Act of 1900. No other book has told that story with equal breadth and precision, the genesis and development of the greenback, its yielding to the silver dollar, the varying attitude of the two leading parties toward the question of soft money, and the attitude of the successive presidential administrations toward this overshadowing question.

Voluminous appendixes will be found to contain much historical material not easily accessible to the general reader, such as the colonial currency and mint laws, some of Hamilton's reports, and the principal acts of the Federal Congress pertaining to money and currency. The only inaccuracy worth calling attention to is the occasional use of the term clearing-house certificate for clearing-house loan certificate. The omission of the word loan has, however, become too common to deserve more than passing comment.

J. C. SCHWAB.

The sixth volume of the *Public Papers of George Clinton* (Published by the State, 1902, pp. xlviii, 918) comprises documents covering the period from July, 1780, to May, 1781. The material is intrinsically interesting and contains much of value. Sufficient comment has already been passed upon the editorial work (see *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VI. 391; VII. 402; VIII. 388). Nothing can be added, unfortunately. Even the policy of the editor with reference to illustrations is unchanged, this last volume containing a view of "The Odell House" at Dobbs Ferry.

H. A. C.

It is perhaps unnecessary to take *au sérieux* Thomas E. Watson's *The Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson* (New York, D. Appleton and

Company, 1903, pp. xxii, 534). If partizanship and brilliant dogmatic assertion constitute history, then this is history. The author is, however, himself so out of patience with those he calls "historians", that it may be that he does not wish to be classed among historical writers. If so, we will have to find a new classification for the proper labeling of the products of his pen. It is indeed regrettable that an author capable of writing so well should not write better; for, in truth, much of his description and narration is as vivid and brilliant as it is reckless. Take, for example, the chapter on the Genet episode: who could get from that chapter aught save a display of democratic pyrotechnics? How much ignorance does it show of the facts in the case that have been brought to light by the patient investigation of the despised historian. We cannot help thinking, however, that such a demonstrative, exclamatory, interjectory book as this is an extravagant example of what some reactionists from modern exact scholarship consider history should be. There is no small number of people who cry out for entertaining history, and some there are who wish it dramatized and novelized. But there are others, not few in number, who wish to know the facts, and are not yearning for the opinions and the oratory of historical poetasters. Of course history should be made just as interesting, just as entertaining, as the truth will permit. The really great historian is an artist as well as an investigator. But exclamation and allegation are not helpful in transmuting common mud into a marble statue, nor do mere brilliant sentences satisfy the person seeking truth and sober judgment and wise guidance.

Nelson and the Neapolitan Jacobins. Documents relating to the Suppression of the Jacobin Revolution at Naples, June, 1799. Edited by H. C. Gutteridge, M.A., late Scholar of King's College, Cambridge. (London, printed for the Navy Records Society, 1903, pp. cxvii, 351.) This volume contains the documentary evidence relating to Nelson's conduct at Naples in June, 1799. Of its contents, much was previously in print, but scattered throughout different volumes. Printed here for the first time are the logs of the *Seahorse* and *Foudroyant*, forty letters from Nelson to Acton in the early part of 1799, six letters from Queen Caroline to Lady Hamilton, and much of the correspondence between Hamilton, Nelson, and the court at Palermo from June 21 to June 30. The material here presented, with an English translation of papers not in that language, will enable the English reader to examine at first hand the charges brought by Southey and others against Nelson. With respect to these charges, the editor himself, in an interesting, well-written introduction, reaches an acquittal. On the principal point, the capitulation of St. Elmo, it appears indeed that Ruffo, in signing the capitulation, exceeded his instructions, and Nelson, in disregarding it, fulfilled the wishes of the court. On the whole, however, some will feel that such technicalities, as a cloak for Nelson's conduct, furnish but little more than the hem. Revigliano and Castellamare capitulated to Captain

Foote, and Nelson held, in this case, that the promise, since it emanated from an English officer, must be scrupulously observed. Is Italian honor less sacred? If Ruffo exceeded his instructions, he also reconquered a kingdom. And if this service was not enough to justify favorable consideration of his wishes, did not the garrison of St. Elmo, by capitulating in good faith, acquire rights which the court and Nelson were bound in honor to respect?

H. M. BOWMAN.

The Expansion of Russia, 1815 to 1900. By Francis Henry Skrine, F.S.S. [Cambridge Historical Series, edited by G. W. Prothero, Litt. D.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1903, pp. viii, 386.) A book dealing with the expansion of Russia is in truth very timely at this moment when the process is being so suddenly and violently checked, however temporarily. Still it is a pity that the use of the above title, perhaps through no fault of the author, provokes the sharpest criticism we have to make of this, the latest addition to the Cambridge Historical Series. The title, whoever chose it, is misleading, for it seems to imply that Russian expansion has chiefly taken place within the limits of the time indicated, which is far from being the case. To be sure, Russian dominions were greatly extended between 1815 and 1900, even if less so than were, during the same period, those of Great Britain and France, or than the United States, if we go back to include the Louisiana purchase. Nevertheless we must not forget that the expansion of Russia has been pretty continuous for some four hundred years, indeed it began more than twice as long ago. It was also most rapid in the seventeenth century, which saw the annexation of the larger half of Siberia. We therefore regret that Mr. Skrine appears to fall into the common error of regarding it as a recent phenomenon.

His book itself, though hardly laying claim to profound scholarship, is in the main quite satisfactory. After a few pages of rather rhetorical introduction, full of sweeping statements, some of which will hardly bear close scrutiny, the writer begins his narrative with the Congress of Vienna, and thenceforth he proceeds straight ahead without digression. His style is clear, his tone is impartial, and his judgment generally sound. He treats all his emperors with much sympathy, especially Alexander I. and Nicholas I., though he does not attempt to minimize the faults of either. He is also careful throughout, and only here and there does one notice a slip, as for instance when (p. 228) he speaks of Shamil at Gunib as having been blockaded into submission, whereas in reality the stronghold was scaled by some daring soldiers; and it is also an error to call the recession of Kulja "the only example of a voluntary recoil in Russia's eastward advance". The treaty of Nerchinsk with China in 1689 and of Resht with Persia in 1732 are two other notable cases.

These slight inadvertences are too few to affect the value of the work. Its limitations are of more consequence. Having to cover a good

deal of ground at a rapid rate, Mr. Skrine confines his "Expansion" to its territorial aspect. He therefore does not enter into questions of industrial development or into the growth of population during the last half-century, though these have done far more than her mere increase in acreage to add to Russia's power in recent times. Even the abolition of serfdom is treated in a manner so inadequate as to suggest that the author does not feel at home in the subject, which is unfortunate. In this respect his volume suffers by comparison with Kleinschmidt's *Drei Jahrhunderte russischer Geschichte*, but it is distinctly better as a whole than the *Histoire de la Russie depuis la mort de Paul I^{er} jusqu'à l'Avènement de Nicolas II* of Créhange and the *History of Russia from Peter the Great to Nicholas II.*, by Mr. W. R. Morfill, who by the way is erroneously termed G. Morfill in Mr. Skrine's bibliography. This bibliography, which includes authorities in Russian as well as in the western languages, is in the main well chosen, though like most such lists it appears at times a bit arbitrary. The maps are tolerable, the transcription of Russian names is usually careful and consistent. Altogether Mr. Skrine has produced an excellent little book.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Four Years under Marse Robert. By Major Robert Stiles. (New York and Washington, The Neale Publishing Company, 1903, pp. xvi, 368.) Major Stiles is a graduate of Yale and a Southern man who was a law-student in New York when the Civil War began. He returned to the south, joined the Richmond Howitzers, and, either as private or officer, served in the artillery till the end of the struggle. He writes as an intelligent observer of the things that came under his own eyes, namely, the life of the privates and of the lower officers. He was not in a position to speak with experience in reference to the larger movements of the army. Perhaps, too, if we may judge from his narrative, he is not a man well informed in the history of both sides of the war. But neither of these facts renders his book useless. Indeed, in a very important sense it is a valuable record. It gives with much vividness the details of the life of the private soldiers, their loyalty, their hopefulness, their patient endurance of privation, their susceptibility to religious excitement, their faith in their leaders, and their careless levity in the face of death and privation. Such a record goes far to explain the splendid soldierly qualities of Lee's ragged and famished troops. Major Stiles has told his story with commendable straightforwardness. At times one feels that he is too much of a partizan, and at other times one is apt to think that he admits to his pages too many trivial things. But one ought to remember that it is much for even a trained historical student to divest himself of his prejudices, and as to trivial things, that is a matter of taste. For the writer of Civil War history *Four Years under Marse Robert* will furnish much illustrative material. For the general reader it will prove itself an interesting and vivid narrative of a phase of our national history of which none of us ought to be ignorant.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

Journals of Field-Marshal Count von Blumenthal for 1866 and 1870-1871. Edited by Count Albrecht von Blumenthal. Translated by Major A. D. Gillespie-Addison. (London, Edward Arnold; New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. iv, 347.) As chief of staff to the crown-prince of Prussia in the campaigns of 1866 and 1870, Count Blumenthal played a considerable rôle, and was well placed to get the range of men of higher station than his own. The most noticeable thing about his *Journals* is the scant treatment which the great issues and achievements receive. His outlook is that of the subaltern, without the subaltern's attachment and devotion to a superior. His daily entries usually report the weather conditions, chronicle his not infrequent bodily ailments, find fault with the measures of his superiors and their failure to award him due recognition, and for the rest, reflect his commonplace vindictiveness toward the French and his low opinion of the masses of his own countrymen.

About many of these matters he must have been well informed, but his accuracy as a narrator cannot be thoroughly tested, because for the most part the data for verification are not at hand. In one conspicuous case, however, his lapse into misstatement is surprising. Neither the time of the surrender at Sedan, nor the place of meeting of the king and the emperor is correctly given. *

His one contribution to our knowledge of the time is the successful refutation, so far as he is concerned, of Bismarck's charge that the opposition in high quarters to the bombardment of Paris was due to English petticoat influence and was therefore a bit of mawkish sentimentality. Count Blumenthal's wife was an Englishwoman, and he was opposed to the bombardment, but he was not moved thereto by political or humanitarian or sentimental considerations. His spontaneous outbursts against his country's enemies, actual or potential, leave no room for doubt upon that point, and he shows his teeth to French or English quite impartially, as the mood prompts. The exposition of the military grounds for the reduction of Paris by the method of starvation rather than by the use of cannon is clear and strong. And it was justified by the event.

JOHN H. CONEY.

Actual Government as applied under American Conditions. By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. xlv, 599). As the title indicates, the book emphasizes the present activities of political machinery in America. It is a comprehensive treatise upon the whole range of local, state, and federal government. The work is especially adapted for the use of students in high-schools and colleges. Each chapter is prefaced with a carefully assorted list of references for the guidance of students. The author does not profess to discuss legal and constitutional theories, but devotes the space at his command to description of the machinery of government and of its manner of working. Under the limitations thus imposed he has produced the most detailed

and thorough treatise on the subject that has yet appeared. In fact, the question may be fairly raised whether the limit has not been reached of a rational attempt to combine in a single volume a well-proportioned discussion of the entire scope of our political activities.

Professor Hart's book is indicative of a tendency to give large space to the dynamics of politics. While predominantly descriptive, it is also to a very limited extent expository, and the space which in earlier texts was devoted to explanation of principles is here occupied with a setting forth of the problems arising in practical politics. The attention of the reader is constantly carried from the mechanism of government to the methods of political activity. It is evidently not the author's primary intention to advocate reforms, yet he nevertheless advances many acute criticisms and observations upon defects in political organization and faults in political methods. Several pages are devoted to consideration of the party boss in politics; the maladjustment of party machinery to city politics is described with great clearness, and with the setting forth of defects there is intelligent discussion of methods of improvement. A good deal of attention is given to civil-service reform, both in its relation to the federal government and to state and municipal government as well. The author is to be congratulated upon his success in giving to a work of such limitless detail the air of up-to-date vitality.

Illuminating maps and diagrams and a good index add to the usefulness of the book.

JESSE MACY.

The Centralization of Administration in Ohio. By Samuel P. Orth, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Vol. XVI, No. 3.] (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1903, pp. 177.) This is one of the series of five studies dealing with the centralization of control in the field of local government in as many different states. The administrative functions considered by Dr. Orth are "Public Education", "Taxation and Local Finance", "Charities and Corrections", "State Health Administration", and "Miscellaneous Functions" — the last embracing the powers of inspection (as of mines, railroads, food-products, etc.) exercised by the state by virtue of its police authority.

The tendencies toward centralization have been of slow growth in Ohio, and Mr. Orth has had to do a good deal of historical research to trace them, thereby bringing together much new and valuable material. His conclusions are summed up at the end of each chapter and are illustrated by statistical tables. In the field of education he points out that centralization has been making rapid progress during the last fourteen years, but still leaves much to be desired. He fails to note (p. 72) among the evidences of lack of centralization in this field the deplorable want of uniformity in the school year, which is subject to local variation in length from twenty-four weeks up to forty-four. In taxation he finds the centralizing movement shown in the change by which the state revenue is largely derived from taxes on corporations, and in the evolu-

tion of the supervisory powers of the state auditor. In charities and corrections he shows that a measure of concentration has been wrought by the moral rather than by the legal authority of the board of state charities; while in the spheres of public health and inspection, which are of much later growth, the central authorities have been vested with considerable power from the outset. A few slips in dates and minor facts have been noticed, but the monograph is none the less a distinct contribution on the side of the history of administration in Ohio.

WILBUR H. SIEBERT.

A List of Books (with References to Periodicals) on the Philippine Islands in the Library of Congress, with Chronological List of Maps in the Library of Congress. By A. P. C. Griffin, Chief of Division of Bibliography, and P. Lee Phillips, Chief of Division of Maps and Charts. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1903, pp. xv, 397.) This is a reprint in separate form of a Philippine bibliography already issued as a Senate document. It is to be followed also by the publication in separate form of the *Biblioteca Filipina*, or Philippine bibliography, prepared by Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, of Manila. The two may be expected to form the most complete and useful Philippine bibliography in existence.

The few students who have lately given some attention to Philippina in the United States will not be surprised at the length of the list of books and maps accumulated by the Library of Congress, in large part since 1898, since which time special efforts have been made in this direction. There are 142 pages devoted to titles of works on the Philippines prior to American occupation. These are classified by subjects, showing the Library of Congress to be best supplied in the sections of description, discovery and early exploration, ethnology, history, languages, missions, natural history, and political and social economy. It is difficult, however, to classify with precision a great proportion of the works on the Philippines, especially of the early friar-chronicles, which were discursions in pious vein on nearly every feature of Spanish conquest and Philippine (though not Filipino) life. For instance, the valuable fourteen-volume work of Father Juan de la Concepción (Manila, 1788-1792) is here listed under missions, when, as a matter of fact, it is the best historical work on the islands up to the nineteenth century. To note a small slip in the excellent bibliographical introduction by Mr. Griffin, the *Estadismo* of Father Martinez de Zuñiga does not cover the author's observations to 1818, the year of his death, but only to 1805 or 1806.

In the section devoted to writings produced by the last five years of American occupation, we find that the Library catalogues nearly two hundred volumes, aside from some two hundred and fifty public documents of the government of the United States. It is better supplied with miscellaneous writings on this period produced in Spain than with documents of the Filipino insurgents. Approximately one thousand articles in periodicals are catalogued, practically all appearing since May,

1898, and few foreign periodicals being cited aside from those of England. Yet this list does not, of course, deal with any articles appearing in the daily press, unless reproduced in more permanent form, nor is it, moreover, a complete list, though the publications not here listed are in the main unimportant. If some guide is needed as to the mass of data accumulated since 1898, it is none the less necessary for the whole preceding period of Philippine history; there has been a tremendous waste of ink both before and since 1898.

Mr. Griffin has appended very useful subject and author indexes. In the section devoted to maps and charts of the Philippines, 132 pages in all, Mr. Phillips has similarly appended geographical and author indexes. He has catalogued 860 maps and charts of the Philippines, or portions of the archipelago, from 1519 to 1903, to be found in the Library of Congress.

JAMES A. LE ROY.

NOTES AND NEWS

We have received a communication from Professor Jameson in which he states that in reviewing Volume VII. of the *Cambridge Modern History* (REVIEW, IX. 367, 368) he unwittingly did Professor McMaster an injustice in alluding to certain omissions in his chapters. He states that he has since been informed, though not by Professor McMaster nor with his knowledge, that the chapters by President Wilson and Professor Bigelow were already in print before Professor McMaster was invited to contribute the intervening chapters, and that he was requested not to duplicate anything which had already been covered.

After a long illness, filled with great suffering, Professor Hermann Eduard von Holst died at his home in Freiburg on January 20, at the age of sixty-two years, thus bringing to its close a career long, eventful, and varied. He was born on June 19, 1841, at Fellin, in Livonia, the son of a poor Lutheran clergyman. He received his early education in a private gymnasium in Fellin, and in the spring of 1860 entered the German university at Dorpat, where he spent three years. After two years at Heidelberg he received his doctorate, but the hardships and privations he had endured for the sake of his education left a permanent effect upon his health. In 1867, while in France, he published a political pamphlet on the significance of the attempt made the preceding year on the life of the czar, in which he criticized the Russian government and ministry so pointedly that only a timely warning saved him from possible exile in Siberia. As it was, he engaged a steerage passage to America and arrived in New York alone and without money. In the course of his struggle for bare existence he passed from the position of day-laborer to that of newspaper correspondent and teacher. The turning-point in his career was when, through the instrumentality of von Sybel and Friedrich Kapp, to whom he had become known, he was engaged by three Bremen merchants, interested in spreading in Germany better knowledge of American life, to write for German readers a few magazine or newspaper articles upon America. From this small beginning grew his *Constitutional History of the United States*. In 1872 he became Professor Extraordinarius at the newly-founded University of Strassburg, filling the chair of American history and constitutional law. Before leaving America to accept this position he was married to Miss Annie Isabelle Hatt. Before long he published the first volume of his *Verfassung und Demokratie der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*, which led almost directly to his becoming professor of modern history at Freiburg in 1874. In 1878 the Prussian Academy of Sciences sent him to

America to gather material for more volumes of his *Constitutional History*. During this and a later visit to America he lectured at several universities and received more than one offer of a chair of history. From 1881 to 1892 he actively engaged in public life, being a member of the Baden Landtag and part of the time privy councillor. In 1892 he came to the University of Chicago as head of the department of history, a position which he held until his death, the university refusing to accept his resignation when, in 1899, he was obliged to stop active work. As a historian his fame rests chiefly on his *Constitutional History*: other works of his are, *John C. Calhoun*, *John Brown*, and the *French Revolution Tested by Mirabeau's Career*. He was a stern moralist and valued history chiefly for its practical bearing on current problems. He can hardly be said to belong to the scientific school of historical writers, but his devotion to history, his keen insight, his masterly powers of generalization, give him a place high in his profession. Chief among the appreciations of his life and work may be noted the articles by Professors Jameson and Laughlin in *The University of Chicago Record* for October, 1903, and those in the *Nation* of January 28 and the *Review of Reviews* for March.

Parke Goodwin, formerly editor of the *New York Evening Post*, died at New York January 7. He was born in Paterson, New Jersey, in 1816, and graduated from Princeton. He was with the *New York Evening Post* for fifty years, and was for a time editor of *Putnam's Monthly*, and of the Brook Farm newspaper, *The Harbinger*. Among his best-known works are *Pacific and Constructive Democracy*, *Popular Views of the Doctrines of Charles Fourier*, *Cyclopedia of Biography*, *History of France*, and *Out of the Past*.

Rufus Blanchard, said to have been the oldest cartographer in the United States, died at Wheaton, Illinois, January 3. He was the author of a *Political History of the United States*, a *History of Illinois*, and a *History of the Northwest and Chicago*.

Richard Price Hallowell, author of *The Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts* and *The Pioneer Quakers*, died at West Medford, Massachusetts, on January 5.

Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Wormeley Latimer, novelist, contributor to the magazines, and author of several historical works of a popular order, died January 4, in her eighty-second year. She left about half-finished a book on modern Germany, which was intended to be the concluding volume in her series on various European countries in the nineteenth century.

The death of Sir Leslie Stephen occurred in London on February 22. Historical students will recall especially his work on *The Dictionary of National Biography*, of which he was editor until 1891, during the issue of the first twenty-six volumes. They will have in mind also, among numerous other titles, his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, *Studies of a Biographer*, *The English Utilitarians*, lives of Sir

Henry Fawcett and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, and recently a modest part as editor of the letters of John Richard Green.

Among recent deaths in the historical ranks is that of Ulysse Robert, whose service is attested by his *Inventaire des Cartulaires*, his *Inventaire Sommaire des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques*, his large part in the *Catalogue des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques de France*, which is now nearly finished; and by numerous other works, notably books on Pope Stephen X., Pope Calixtus II., and Philibert of Chalon.

The life and work of Mommsen were such as to call for considerable review in the historical periodicals of Europe. Attention may be called especially to the article by F. Haverfield in the January number of the *English Historical Review*; to the long account, by K. J. Neumann, in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (XCII. 2); to the brief but well-thought account by C. Jullian in the *Revue Historique* for January; and to the study by T. F. Tout in the *Cornhill Magazine* for February. The appreciative funeral address delivered by Adolph Harnack has been published in the form of an inexpensive pamphlet: *Rede bei der Begräbnisfeier Theodor Mommsens* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs). At least one account among those in American periodicals should be mentioned, that by J. B. Carpenter in the *Atlantic Monthly* for March.

Dr. G. T. Lapsley, of the University of Pennsylvania, has been appointed lecturer and fellow in Trinity College, Cambridge, to take the place of Professor Leathes. His work will consist largely of lecturing and will be wholly in the field of medieval English and continental history.

Transitional Eras in Thought, by Dr. A. C. Armstrong (Macmillan, 1904), is "an inquiry into the development of western thought and culture, and particularly their development during the epochs" when they may be said to be in a state of transition. Throughout the book, however, the aim is to analyze the conditions and changes of the present age. The chapter on "The Historical Spirit and the Theory of Evolution" is of especial interest to the student of history. In it the author discusses the increased interest in historical studies and the change from the pragmatic to the scientific method, and seeks to discover both the causes and the results of this development.

The relation between history and sociology forms the subject of the opening article of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for October: "Histoire et Sociologie", by Paul Mantoux. Two other articles of the same number of this review may also be noted here: "La Philosophie de l'Histoire de Carlyle", by P. Hensel; and "Les Rapports de la Géographie Humaine avec la Géographie de la Vie", an account of progress of work in this field, with some suggestions as to work still to do, by P. Vidal de la Blache. The December number contains, among other matter, "Les Sources Psychologiques des Théories des Races", by F. Hertz; and the second of a series of articles by P. Huvelin, on work done and to do on the history of commercial law: "Droit Commercial (les Travaux

d'Ensemble et les Sources)'. The first article of the series, which treated of the definition and general evolution of commercial law, appeared in the *Revue* for last August.

Messrs. Lawrence and Bullen, of London, announce a series of volumes under the general title of "The Story of Exploration", which are designed to give a complete history of the discovery of the globe from the earliest records up to the present time. Each volume will tell the story of the discovery of one region of the globe, and will be biographical as well as geographical in character, since the narrative will be centered round the men who carried on the work. The first volume of the series has already appeared, and is a record of the exploration of the Nile and its basin: *The Nile Quest*, by Sir Harry Johnston. Naturally several of the subjects to be treated relate to America: the St. Lawrence basin and its border lands; the western trails; the Mississippi basin and its border lands; and the Amazon and its feeders. The series is to be edited by J. Scott Keltie.

The nineteenth volume of the *Genealogist* (New Series; London, George Bell and Sons, 1903) offers as its leading feature "A Manuscript Relating to the Offley Family", which contains many quaint details upon the life and habits of the Elizabethan period. It is contributed by G. C. Bower. An article of interest for American history is on "Stephen Bachiler and the Plough Company of 1630", in which Mr. V. C. Sanborn, of Kenilworth, Illinois, aims to set before English antiquaries the main facts about the Company of Husbandmen, or Company of the Plough, in the hope of obtaining their help in tracing the reason for the company's existence and the origin of its known agents. There are also numerous other pieces, the most considerable among them being the conclusion of the "History of the Family of Wrottesley of Wrottesley".

A catalogue which may be of interest to students of the history of the Inquisition is listed among the recent publications of Messrs. Blackwood and Sons, London: *Catalogue of a Collection of Original MSS. formerly belonging to the Holy Office of the Inquisition in the Canary Islands, and now in the Possession of the Marquess of Bute*, two vols., by W. de G. Birch.

The Oxford University Press has sent us *The Geography of South and East Africa* (Oxford, 1904, pp. 169), which is a new edition of Volume IV., Part II., of C. P. Lucas's *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*. The work has been revised to 1903 by H. E. Egerton; and in addition Mr. Egerton has written two new chapters, on the Transvaal and on the Orange River Colony. The text is supplemented by six newly-drawn maps, and there is an index to the principal proper names.

The long-awaited second part of the *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique*, by Ch.-V. Langlois, has just appeared, through the house of Hachette (Paris). It presents the outlines of the history and organization of historical studies.

Professors Herbert D. Foster and Sidney B. Fay have sent us a *Syllabus of Medieval and Modern European History*, which was prepared primarily for use in their classes (Hanover, N. H., Dartmouth College, 1903, Part I., pp. ix, 20; Part II., pp. xi, 32). It gives a short, clear outline, extending in the first part to the end of the fifteenth century, and in the second from 1492 to 1789. Appropriate lists of references are given.

An important reference list is that compiled by Miss A. R. Hasse and published in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* under the title "List of Books and some Articles in Periodicals in the New York Public Library, relating to Political Rights, Constitutions, and Constitutional Law". Parts I. and II. have been published in the January and February *Bulletins*, respectively. Part I. is a list of general treatises and papers, and fills thirty columns. Part II. is a seventy-four column list of references to foreign constitutions, arranged alphabetically by countries with a subarrangement by bibliographies, collections of texts, and commentaries.

A fifth edition of Hall's *Treatise on International Law* is announced by the Oxford University Press. It is edited by J. B. Atlay, and new material relating to events in China and Japan, the Venezuelan boundary dispute, the Hague Conference, and the Spanish-American and South African wars has been added in order to bring the edition to date.

Turkish Life in Town and Country, by Lucy M. J. Garnett (Putnam's, 1904), is a recent addition to "Our European Neighbors" series. It is well illustrated and contains accounts of the inhabitants and institutions of Turkey; town, harem, and country life; religion, education, customs, and manners. The different nationalities are treated and there are chapters on monastic, nomad, and brigand life.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

L. Bréhier begins in the *Revue Historique* for January a study upon an old subject, the royal power as described by the Homeric poems; but he considers it from a relatively neglected side, its position with reference to authority in justice: "La Royauté Homérique et les Origines de l'État en Grèce".

Two recent numbers of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* (Paris, Bouillon) are devoted to ancient history: Fascicle 142, "Histoire de la Conquête Romaine de la Dacie et des Corps d'Armée qui y ont pris part", by Victoria Vaschide; Fascicle 144, "Le Nil à l'Époque Pharaonique, son Rôle et son Culte en Égypte", by Charles Palanque.

Samuel Dill, well known by his book on Roman society in the last century of the Western Empire, has now written a similar book on the earlier imperial period: *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, which is announced to be published soon (The Macmillan Company).

The correspondence between M. Cornelius Fronto, the famous orator, and his pupil Marcus Aurelius, or such part of it as was discovered in the

early part of the last century, formed the subject of a lecture delivered last December by the Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford, Dr. Robinson Ellis; and this lecture is now published by the Oxford University Press: *The Correspondence of Fronto and M. Aurelius* (Oxford, 1904, pp. 29).

An important study concerning the Roman Empire in the later third century appears in Fascicle 89 of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*: "Essai sur le Règne de l'Empereur Aurélien (270-275)", by Léon Homo (Paris, Fontemoing).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

The imperial coronation of Charles the Great is the subject of a critical study by W. Ohr, just published through J. C. B. Mohr, in Tübingen: *Die Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen*.

An important addition to available sources concerning the Iconoclastic movement has been made through an edition of a hitherto unpublished work of Nicephorus, written after his removal from the patriarchate, on the Iconoclast council assembled by Leo the Armenian in 815: *Adversus Concilium Iconomachorum Constantinopolitanum anno 815, Antirrhetici Libri Duo*, by D. Serruys. Among its merits is that it brings to light the acts of this council (Paris, Welter).

The second number to appear in the forty-volume "Handbuch" of medieval and modern history that is being edited by G. von Below and F. Meinecke relates to the political history of the later middle ages: J. Loserth, *Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters von 1197 bis 1492* (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg). The third number, which is announced as about ready, belongs to the list of volumes on auxiliary sciences and antiquities: *Historische Geographie*, by K. Kretschmer.

The publication of material relating to the Avignon popes goes gradually on. Recently the first fascicle was issued of the *Lettres Communes du Pape Jean XXII. (1316-1334)*, the analyses being done by G. Molat (Paris, Fontemoing); also the first volume of a new collection of Vatican material relating to the history of Bohemia: *Monumenta Vaticana Res Gestas Bohemicas Illustrantia. I. Acta Clementis VI. (1342-1352)* (Prague, Rivnac).

The eastern Roman Empire has just been treated, with reference to its social and political evolution, in a two-volume work by P. Grenier: *L'Empire Byzantin, son Évolution Sociale et Politique* (Paris, Plon-Nourrit).

The publication has been begun of an important work on the history of the church in the later middle ages: *Papsttum und Kirchenreform. Vier Kapitel zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, by J. Haller, of the University of Marburg. Two of the proposed four chapters appear in the first volume (Berlin, Weidmann), and present, according to a circular of information written by the author, some remarkable matter in regard to the papal administration in the fourteenth century, and also a new view of the origin of the Gallican liberties. The third and fourth

chapters, to appear in a second volume, will deal with the struggle for reform at Constance and Basel. In this connection may be noted also the first volume of *Die päpstlichen Annalen in Deutschland während des XIV. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn, F. Schöningh).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Maurice M. Hassett, *The Beginnings of the Temporal Power* (Catholic University Bulletin, January); B. Monod, *De la Méthode Historique chez Guibert de Nogent* (Revue Historique, January); *Franciscan Literature* (Edinburgh Review, January); J. Guiraud, *Le "Consolamentum" Cathare* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); A. Lalande, *Revue Générale: La Physique au Moyen Age* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October).

MODERN HISTORY.

A posthumous work by the late Bishop Stubbs, consisting of essays relating to the history of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is announced by Messrs. Longmans.

The January number of the *English Historical Review* contains continuations of "The Dutch on the Amazon and Negro in the Seventeenth Century", by G. Edmundson, and "The Northern Question in 1716", by J. F. Chance.

Students of the Seven Years' War will find of importance to them the *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales de l'Aube Antérieures à 1790. Série E. (Fonds de Saxe)*, the first volume of which was published near the end of last year. The documents analyzed belonged to the archives of Prince Xavier of Saxony, and relate entirely to this war.

Those who may be interested in the Countess of Albany will find much new material in letters she wrote to friends in Siena: *Lettres Inédites de la Comtesse d'Albany à ses Amis de Sienne (1797-1820)*, prepared for publication by L. G. Pélissier. They will form two volumes; the first has already appeared (Paris, Fontemoing).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals; A. D. White, *Fra Paolo Sarpi* (Atlantic Monthly, January and February); A. Mansuy, *Le Clergé et le Régime Napoléonien dans le Duché de Varsovie*, concluded (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, December); A. Sorel, *La Route d'Jena* (Revue de Paris, January 1 and 15); Chr. Waas, *Bonaparte in Jaffa (Zwei napoleonische Kontroversen)* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, January).

GREAT BRITAIN.

Perhaps a new annotated edition of Macaulay's essays was needed. If so, the new edition in three volumes published by Methuen in London and the Putnams in New York will certainly meet the demand. One may well wonder whether the reader who wishes the flavor and swing of Macaulay's style and to be carried along by the rush of his impetuous assertions, which are never tinged by doubt, will hesitate about allowing such sensations to be disturbed by an intrusive note, be it ever so learned.

But the volumes are attractive, and the historical annotation has been laboriously done and gives evidence of scholarship. Though the print is possibly too small to be agreeable, it is a pleasure to be able to hold lightly and easily in the hand an octavo of nearly six hundred pages.

St. Aldhelm: his Life and Times (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), by the Right Reverend G. F. Browne, comprises a series of lectures delivered in the Cathedral Church of Bristol during Lent, 1902. It is not merely a life of Aldhelm, but devotes much space to William of Malmesbury and to contemporary ecclesiastical history, and contains critical discussions of sources and of Saxon remains. The relations of England and Ireland in Saxon times are treated, and there is an account of the origin of the English coronation service. The book may best be characterized, perhaps, as a popular study in English antiquities.

Asser's Life of King Alfred has been edited, with introduction and commentary, by W. H. Stevenson. Associated with it in the same volume is *The Annals of Saint Neots*, erroneously ascribed to Alfred (Oxford, University Press).

A beginning has at last been made upon the work of editing in worthy fashion the law reports of the reign of Edward II.: *Year-Books of Edward II.*, Vol. I., 1307-1309, edited for the Selden Society by F. W. Maitland. Besides the text, translation, and notes, there is a remarkable introduction of some hundred pages. Only a few of the year-books for other reigns have been edited in a manner that approaches present standards, and Professor Maitland pleads that English scholars may undertake to edit the entire series to which these reports belong.

A plan for a scientific bibliography of British history from 1485 to 1901, to serve as a continuation of the work of Gross for the medieval period, was set forth by G. W. Prothero in his last presidential address to the Royal Historical Society. The address will appear in the next volume of *Transactions*, soon to be issued.

The Electress Sophia and the Hanoverian Succession, by A. W. Ward, has been received as a scholarly and effective account of the succession of the House of Hanover in its proper setting: not so much a chapter simply of English history as an event of long preparation and far-reaching consequences in European history (London, Goupil).

England in the Mediterranean, by Julian Corbett, a two-volume study of the rise and influence of British power within the straits, covering the years 1603-1713, is published by Messrs. Longmans.

In Volume XXVI. of its *Publications* the Navy Records Society inaugurates *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Naval Manuscripts in the Pepysian Library* at Magdalene College, Cambridge, edited by J. R. Tanner. There are in the Pepysian Library about seventy-five manuscript volumes relating to the navy, of which fourteen contain the Admiralty Letters, *i. e.*, the letter-books of the office of the secretary to the

admiralty. These last are the most valuable of the Pepysian papers for the purposes of the student of English naval history during Pepys's administration. The second and succeeding volumes of the *Descriptive Catalogue* will contain a calendar of the Admiralty Letters, with a full index of names and subjects. The present volume contains Pepys's *Register of the Royal Navy* and his *Register of Sea Officers*, together with a general introduction of some 250 pages, by the editor, which indicates the bearing of the Pepysian papers on naval administration during the period 1660-1688, dealing especially with the phases of higher administration, finance, men, pay, victuals, discipline, ships, and guns.

Prominent among the matter which appeared in the second number of the *Scottish Historical Review* is an article on "The Fiscal Policy of Scotland before the Union", by W. R. Scott. It sets forth connections of the protective system of the seventeenth century with the Darien scheme and the Union.

Caroline Matilda, the youngest sister of George III., and wife for a time of Christian VII. of Denmark, is the subject of two handsome volumes by W. H. Wilkins, already known by other books on the House of Hanover: *A Queen of Tears: Caroline Matilda, Queen of Denmark and Norway, and Princess of Great Britain* (Longmans, Green, and Co.).

We have before us the first four volumes of *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee and published by the Clarendon Press. In this form there are to be in all sixteen volumes, beautifully printed and illustrated. The annotation shows patient research and the thoughtful attention given by a devoted editor. Most of the letters are to be found, of course, in the Cunningham edition, but some are not. Where the original letter was to be found the editor seems to have made use of it in preparing copy and not blindly to have followed previous editors. There is ground for expecting this to be the definitive edition of materials whose interest for the student of the eighteenth century knows no abating.

Students of the crowded military history of the last years of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth century will find interesting and profitable matter in a recent work by R. S. Rait: *The Life and Campaigns of Hugh, First Viscount Gough, Field-Marshal*, two vols. (London, Constable). And like reference may be made to *The Life of John Colborne, Lord Seaton*, by G. C. Moore-Smith (New York, Dutton).

Two of the five volumes that are to constitute H. W. Paul's *History of Modern England* have now been published. The first opens with a treatment of the last Whig government and Palmerston's foreign policy, and closes with the Russian war; the second goes to the close of the Palmerstonian era (The Macmillan Company).

Noteworthy article in periodical: C. H. Firth, *Clarendon's History of the Rebellion*, Part I., *The Original "History"* (English Historical Review, January).

FRANCE.

The second and concluding volume of C. Enlart's *Manuel d'Archéologie Française* treats of civil and military architecture. The first volume, it will be recalled, dealt with buildings of a religious order (Paris, Picard).

A general review of studies upon the origins of town institutions in medieval France is contributed by G. Bourgin to the December number of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*: "Les Études sur les Origines Urbaines du Moyen Age".

Volume V., by H. Lemonnier, of the Lavis *Histoire de France*, is now complete, dealing with the struggle against the house of Austria and France under Henry II. The next fascicles to appear are those of Volume VI., by M. Mariéjol, on the wars of religion and the establishing of absolute power, 1559-1643.

The *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* has begun a series of critical studies upon the narrative sources of the history of France in the sixteenth century. In the first one, which appeared in the December number, the writer, H. Hauser, hopes while solving a small problem to show again how delicate is the work of handling sixteenth-century texts: "La Date Exacte de la Mort de Louis XII et de l'Avènement de François I".

France is to have for modern history a series, or collection, of original contributions, similar to the numerous "Beiträge" or "Sammlungen" in Germany: the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne*, published under the auspices of the Société d'Histoire Moderne. The first number is "La Peur en Dauphiné (Juillet-Août 1789)", by P. Conard; the second, "L'Origine des Cultes Révolutionnaires", by A. Mathiez.

A commission has been appointed in France to seek out and publish the archive material relating to the economic life of the French Revolution. The work is to be supported by a grant from the government, and M. Jaurès, who presented the measure in the Chamber, heads the commission. It is hoped in this way to do for the economic side of the Revolution what has been done or is being done, owing especially to the publications of M. Aulard, for its political side.

M. F. Masson proceeds with remarkable rapidity with his series of Napoleonic studies. The latest addition to it is entitled *Napoléon et son Fils* (Paris, Ollendorff).

The French soldier in the Napoleonic period is the subject of a new work by J. Morvan: *Le Soldat Impérial, 1800-1814*. So far the first volume has appeared, which deals with such matters as recruiting, instruction, pay, rations, and administration (Paris, Plon-Nourrit).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Camille Daux, *Le Cens Pontifical dans l'Église de France* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); J. Lemoine and A. Lichtenberger, *Madame de Montespan et les Bouchers de Paris* (*Revue de Paris*, January 1); H. Sée, *Les Idées Philosophiques du*

XVIII^e Siècle et la Littérature Prérévolutionnaire (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October and December); P. Bliard, *Les Exploits d'un Conventionnel en Mission. Prisonniers et Prisons (1793-1794)*, refers to Prieur de la Marne (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); Léon Dubreuil, *Essai sur l'Administration Générale d'un District pendant la Révolution. Le District de Redon* (Annales de Bretagne, beginning in the January number); R. Guyot and P. Muret, *Étude Critique sur "Bonaparte et le Directoire"*, par M. Albert Sorel (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, January and February).

ITALY, SPAIN.

The vicissitudes of papal rule in the Patrimony of St. Peter in Tuscany during a great part of the period of the residence of the popes at Avignon is the subject of a long study now running in the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, beginning in Volume XXV., Fascicle 3-4: "Vicende della Dominazione Pontificia nel Patrimonio di S. Pietro in Tuscia dalla Translazione della Sede alla Restaurazione dell' Albornoz". The recent fascicles of this periodical include also, among other matter, a continuation of S. Schiaparelli's "Le Carte Antichi dell'Archivio Capitolare di S. Pietro in Vaticano" (XXV. 3-4); a study by I. Giorgi of the treaty of peace and alliance between Rome and Genoa, 1165-1166, with documents (XXV. 3-4); the conclusion of "Tabularium S. Mariæ Novæ ab An. 982 ad An. 1200", by P. Fedele (XXVI.); and articles on "Il Cardinale Ludovico Simonetta", by E. Sol, "Una Chiesa del Palatino, S. Maria 'In Pallaria'", by P. Fedele, and "Soriano nel Cimino e l'Archivio Suo", by P. Egidi, — all in Volume XXVI.

The *Year-book of the Bibliographical Society of Chicago* for 1902-1903 (Chicago, 1903, pp. 90) contains, among other matter, "Some Bibliographical Notes on Italian Communal History", the paper read by Dr. A. M. Wolfson before the American Historical Association in December, 1902.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Rousseau, *Expulsion des Jésuites en Espagne. Démarches de Charles III pour leur Sécularisation* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); H. Hueffer, *La Fin de la République Napolitaine*, concluded (Revue Historique, January).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA-HUNGARY, SWITZERLAND.

Several interests are appealed to in a new work on German registers of feudal tenures: *Die deutschen Lehnbücher*, by Woldemar Lippert (Leipzig, Teubner). It deals with material to which Diplomatic has as yet given little attention, offers something new on the feudal side of German legal and constitutional history, and emphasizes the importance of the feudal registers as a source for genealogy.

The interesting presentation of "Kaiser Heinrich VII" in the light of recent writings relating to his time, which was contributed by A.

Cartellieri to the twelfth volume of the *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, has been reprinted separately (Heidelberg, G. Koester).

The collection of Luther's table-talk made by John Mathesius, one of Luther's principal table-companions, appeared until recently to be lost, or at least in great part lost. A complete manuscript of it however has at last been found, in the Leipzig city library, and its most important parts have been published, under the editorship of E. Kroker, for the Saxon Royal Historical Commission: *Luthers Tischreden in der Mathesischen Sammlung* (Leipzig, Teubner).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Koser, *Die Preussische Kriegsführung im Siebenjährigen Kriege* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCII. 2); P. Clerget, *Contribution à la Psychologie Politique du Peuple Suisse* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October).

BELGIUM, HOLLAND, SWEDEN.

A complete catalogue of all the known manuscripts—historical and literary—in Holland has been undertaken by W. de Vreese, professor in the University of Ghent: *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta*.

G. des Marez has in the press a detailed work on *L'Organisation du Travail à Bruxelles au XV^e Siècle*, which was crowned in 1902 by the Belgian Academy. With it may be associated a small study which he has lately made in the constitutional history of the craft-gilds, connecting the increased powers of the gilds of barbers, butchers, and bakers of Brussels with the democratic movements of the fifteenth century: *Les Sceaux des Corporations Bruxelloises* (Brussels, Vromant, pp. 24; reprinted from the *Annales de la Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles*, Volume XVIII.).

New material relating to the religious history of the Netherlands is published this year in a volume of the publications of the Belgian Royal Historical Commission: *Recueil des Instructions Générales aux Nonces de Flandre*, by A. Cauchie and R. Maere. The editors, in their work on these instructions, naturally arrived at some general ideas on their character and historical value, which they have set forth in part in the introduction to the *Recueil*, but at greater length in an article in the first number of Volume V. of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*: "Les Instructions Générales aux Nonces des Pays-Bas Espagnols (1596-1635)".

A dozen important studies, by the historian Blok, which have been published in various Dutch reviews during the last few years, have been collected into one volume, entitled *Verspreide Studiën ob het Gebied der Geschiedenis* (Groningen, Wolters). Most of them relate to the history of Holland; three, however, are in a more general field, treating respectively of the historical method, the Jesuits, and the last fifty years from the point of view of history.

The history of landed property in Sweden has lately been set forth, in an octavo of some seven hundred and fifty pages, by Ludovic Beauchet,

professor in the University of Nancy: *Histoire de la Propriété Foncière en Suède* (Paris, Larose).

AMERICA.

Last year the Carnegie Institution decided to establish a bureau of historical research. Reference was made to this in an earlier number of the REVIEW (Vol. VIII. 282). The bureau has undertaken a number of tasks that will be of interest to investigators in American history. It has under way the preparation of what might be termed a current bibliography of American history. Dr. E. C. Richardson, of Princeton, has prepared and is now putting through the press a volume called *Writings of American History and Biography for 1902*. Such materials for 1903 as Dr. Richardson had collected were turned over to Mr. McLaughlin, and it is hoped that "writings" for the last year can soon be printed. It is intended to make the list as nearly exhaustive as possible, to include not only books but periodical articles of any significance, and, of course, to make mention of the proceedings of historical societies. The titles of important books will be accompanied with reference to reviews of their contents, and there is likely to be in addition a few words concerning scope and character, but not quality, of many of the books and articles included in the list.

The *Guide to the Archives of the United States in Washington* is not yet published, but may be expected this spring. It was begun a year ago by Dr. C. H. Van Tyne and Mr. W. G. Leland. Since the beginning of this collegiate year much additional work has been put on this report, and a portion of the copy is in the printer's hands. It will include a careful description of the bodies of records in the various departments of the government, and it will in many instances indicate the structure of the different bureaus and the methods of handling and storing their records. While it is comprehensive, it cannot, from the nature of things, be an index to the millions of documents in the government depositories. It ought to enable the student to know where a certain class of material can be found and in a great many instances will be much more explicit.

Under the auspices of the bureau, Professor C. M. Andrews is making a somewhat similar guide to American material in British archives. The Bodleian Library and the British Museum as well as the Public Record Office are being examined. It is doubtful if this report can be sent to the printer before the first of January. It will probably contain references to documents only as far as 1783. With it will be published a list of printed documents from English archives bearing on American history, and a general description of transcripts of such material now accessible in America. It is hoped that at no distant day a complete list of transcripts in America from British archives can be prepared and published.

An examination of the diplomatic correspondence in our early history is being made in order to ascertain how much has been printed in the

American State Papers and in order that the bureau may have information as to the character and extent of the material. What will develop from this it is as yet too early to say; certainly a systematic study must be of service.

The managing editor of the REVIEW is director of the bureau of historical research, and through the REVIEW reports will probably be made from time to time concerning the work of the bureau and giving information likely to be of service to historical investigators. It will of course be impossible for the director of the bureau to answer every question that may be sent him; but the purpose is to be of use to investigators and to help them to their materials. It may be reasonably hoped that the bureau can be of some service to historical investigators who come to Washington, and be the center of historical investigation in Washington.

It is not the intention of the REVIEW to comment on the grandiloquent advertisements of publishers who seek to impress the book-buying public with the peculiar value of their wares; but it seems to be incumbent on us to file a word of protest against the circulars issued concerning "A Definitive, Authoritative, and Inclusive Narrative History of North America", of which Mr. Guy Carleton Lee is editor-in-chief. In this circular the statement is made that the history is "Based on a Plan Suggested by the American Historical Association". As a matter of fact, the American Historical Association has drawn no plan and suggested no plan. Perhaps the writer of the circular for the definitive history had in mind the proceedings of the Association reported in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1901*, Volume I., page 37:

"The council reported that at a meeting held in New York, November 29, the proposition of a coöperative history of America was carefully considered, and in view of the difficulties involved, the council had voted that it would not be expedient for the American Historical Association to take part in forming or carrying out a plan for the composition or publication of a coöperative history of the United States. On motion, the action of the council was unanimously approved by the Association."

It is to be hoped that the other statements in the advertisement of this "authoritative" and "inclusive" work are more to be relied on than this. We cannot, under the circumstances, too strongly object to the use of the name of the Association for promoting the sale of a coöperative history.

The Harvard University Library has recently issued No. 55 of its *Bibliographical Contributions*, being *Descriptive and Historical Notes on the Library of Harvard University*, by A. C. Potter.

Biographies appear to be the order of the day, next to western travels. Among the more important ones recently published or announced are: Augustus C. Buell's *William Penn* (Appleton, 1904); Harriet C. Cooper's *James Oglethorpe* (Appleton's "Historic Lives" series, 1904); Bayard Tuckerman's *Life of General Philip Schuyler*

(Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1903); a *Life of Captain James Lawrence*, by Commander Albert Gleaves (announced by Putnams); a *Life of Horace Binney*, by Charles Horace Binney (Lippincott); *Samuel Chapman Armstrong*, by his daughter, Edith Armstrong Talbot (Doubleday, Page, and Company); *Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*, by Thomas Cary Johnson (Richmond, 1903); and a *Life of William Hickling Prescott*, by Professor H. T. Peck (announced by Macmillan). Three more Americans are to be represented in the "English Men of Letters" series: *Emerson*, by George Edward Woodberry; *Lowell*, by Henry van Dyke; and *Franklin*, by Owen Wister. Finally the "Unknown Heroes of the Navy" are to be brought to light in a series by that name (announced by Baker and Taylor Company), the first volume of which will be *Moses Brown, Captain U. S. N.*, by E. S. Maclay.

An autobiography notable in a year of notable autobiographies is Simon Newcomb's *The Reminiscences of an Astronomer* (Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1903). From the account of the author's Nova Scotian boyhood in the opening chapter to the narration of his experiences with the "Georgia magnetic girl" in the concluding chapter, it can truthfully be said that there is not an uninteresting page. Even the technical parts, and they are few and far between, easily hold the uninitiated. In fact the work should be of interest to the historian as well as to the astronomer. The chapters on "Scientific Washington", "The Old and New Washington", "Scientific England", "Men and Things in Europe", and "Life at an Observatory" are of great interest for the "inside" information they contain relating to the scientific work of the government and for the near-at-hand views they present of noted men, both in this country and abroad.

Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., would like to know of any letters to or from President Martin Van Buren that have not been published and are in private hands. A memorandum of the name of the writer and the date of the letter will be sufficient.

In *A Critical Study of the Various Dates Assigned to the Birth of Christopher Columbus* (Henry Stevens, Son, and Stiles) Henry Vignaud decides upon 1451 as the correct date. A bibliography of writings on the subject, containing eighty-three titles, is included in the volume.

We have received Volume I. of the twelve-volume reprint of Hakluyt's *Voyages*, by James MacLehose and Sons, publishers to the University of Glasgow (New York, Macmillan). The text is an exact reprint of the edition of 1598-1600. All the maps, plans, and charts have been reproduced in exact facsimile from contemporary sources, and well illustrate the state of cartography in Hakluyt's time. The twelfth volume will contain Professor Walter Raleigh's *Essay on the Life and Work of Hakluyt*, and a full index to the whole text.

An important publication of early voyages is *Jacques Cartier, Sieur de Limonlieu, His Voyages to the St. Lawrence, in the years 1534, 1535-6, and Allied Documents*, announced by Dodd, Mead, and Company. The work is translated from the original manuscripts in the archives of Paris and London, and will be edited by James P. Baxter.

The *Viaje al Río de la Plata (1534-1554)* of Ulrich Schmidel (Buenos Ayres, 1903, pp. 499) is a translation by Samuel A. Lafone Quevedo of the Nuremberg Latin edition of 1599, with facsimile reproductions of its plates. An introduction and annotations are added by the translator, and bibliographical and biographical notes are contributed by Bartolomé Mitre.

The first part of Professor Osgood's *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* will shortly be published by Macmillan. This instalment will be in two volumes and will deal with *The Chartered Colonies: Beginnings of Self-Government*.

A series entitled "Monographs of the American Revolution" is announced by the University Press, of Cambridge, and A. W. Elson and Company, of Boston, in conjunction. The first volume will be a hitherto unpublished essay on Thomas Jefferson, by the late Paul Leicester Ford.

The latest addition to the "Harvard Historical Studies" is *The Administration of the American Revolutionary Army*, by Louis Clinton Hatch. It discusses the subject not at all from the viewpoint of Bolton's *Private Soldier*, but in its more general aspects. Such subjects as appointments, promotions, supplying the army, the army mutineer, the relations between Congress and the commander-in-chief receive full treatment.

The *Orderly Book kept by Jeremiah Fogg*, adjutant-colonel of the Second New Hampshire Regiment during the siege of Boston, has been reprinted from the *Exeter News-Letter*, 1903, where it was printed from a copy of the original manuscript in the Harvard Library.

The *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* for January, 1904, contains the first part of an article of more than purely genealogical interest, by D. R. Jack, entitled "New Brunswick Loyalists of the War of the American Revolution", which is an attempt "to compile a complete list of the Loyalists who settled in what is now the Province of New Brunswick".

Major André's Journal has been published in two volumes by the Bibliophile Society of Boston. The journal is André's daily account of the movements of the British forces from June, 1777, to November, 1778. The original manuscript was recently discovered among the papers of Earl Grey in England, and was purchased by William K. Bixby of St. Louis. The plans and drawings in the journal are reproduced in facsimile, as is also André's letter of appeal to Washington. At the end of the second volume are printed the account of André's execution, from Dr. Thacher's journal, and also the statement of a soldier who was present. The editorial work and introduction are by

Henry Cabot Lodge. The journal is printed on light paper, is bound in heavy vellum, and in each volume as a frontispiece is an etching of Major André.

Charles Henry Hart is preparing for the Grolier Club a *Catalogue of the Engraved Portraits of Washington*. The catalogue will contain nineteen photogravure reproductions and a mezzotint engraving from a portrait never before engraved.

"The History of the Cavalry of the Army of Northern Virginia", by Captain J. G. Harbord, appears in the *Journal of the United States Cavalry Association* for January, as its prize essay for 1903.

Frederick Van Dyne, assistant solicitor for the Department of State, has published a book on *Citizenship of the United States* (Rochester, 1904), in which he sets forth and discusses, in its practical aspects, the law of citizenship. Four phases of the subject are specifically treated: citizenship by birth; naturalization; passports; and expatriation.

Robert Brent Mosher, chief of the Bureau of Appointments of the Department of State, has recently published a compilation for which every student of history should feel grateful. It is entitled *The Executive Register of the United States, 1789-1902*, and gives a complete list of the presidents and of the heads of the executive departments, together with the laws governing their election or appointment, qualifications, and terms of office; the electoral and popular vote at each election; and literal copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. This is the first time this information, particularly that regarding the exact dates of the terms of office of the members of the cabinet, has been made accessible.

Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances, 1787-1903 (*Sen. Doc. 209, 57 Cong., 2 Sess.*), prepared by Frederick T. Wilson of the Adjutant-general's office, is a "continuous and reasonably complete narrative of the domestic insurrections, riots, revolts, and miscellaneous disturbances that have entered into the history of the United States since its beginning, and of the measures that have been taken by the Executive, by Congress, and by the courts to meet, to suppress, to punish them, or to prevent their recurrence". Illustrative documents are scattered freely through the text, and an appendix of some 191 other documents referred to is added.

G. P. Putnam's Sons announce a new edition of Henry Cabot Lodge's *Writings of Alexander Hamilton* in twelve volumes, to be known as the Federal Edition. The text is identical with that of the edition of eighteen years ago, but Mr. Lodge has added a new introduction.

Zachery F. Smith's *The Battle of New Orleans*, with his account of the previous engagements which led up to it, has been reprinted as No. 19 of the *Filson Club Publications*.

The *Statistical Atlas of the Twelfth Census*, prepared under the supervision of Henry Gannett, geographer, which has just been issued, is a

publication of first importance. It is divided into four parts under the headings Population, Vital Statistics, Agriculture, and Manufactures, each of which is preceded by a valuable introduction. Of most value to the student of history probably is the introduction to the section devoted to population, which contains a detailed historical sketch of the distribution of population since 1790, the shifting of its median point, and its elements. The atlas contains 206 plates, of which 100 are devoted to population.

The New York State Library has issued as *Bulletin* 306, January, 1904, a *Digest of Governors Messages, 1903*, including related topics in the President's message, April 1, 1902-April 1, 1903. The *Digest* is the second in its series, and includes, topically arranged, regular messages and special messages recommending legislation, in all the states.

A *Bibliography of the Maps of the State of Maine*, by Edgar Crosby Smith, has been printed for private distribution at Bangor (1903, pp. 29).

We have received *A Brief History of the First Church in Plymouth, 1606-1901*, by John Cuckson, (Boston, 1902), which is in the nature of a summary based upon the principal sources and authorities, of "the most important items in the religious story of the Pilgrims".

A list of references on Shays's Rebellion is printed in the *Quarterly Bulletin* of the Berkshire Athenæum (Pittsfield, Massachusetts) for October, 1903.

The annual meeting of the Rhode Island Historical Society was held in Providence in January. The annual address was delivered by the vice-president, Professor MacDonald; the librarian's report showed that during the year the Channing-Ellery papers, a collection of eight volumes covering the years 1694-1825, and containing the papers of William Ellery, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and of William Channing, the father of William Ellery Channing, have been arranged for use. They are of much value in illustrating the social, economic, and political life of Newport during the latter half of the eighteenth century.

The New York State Library is preparing an index of New York senate and assembly documents from 1777 to 1900, which will make available every special report during that period.

Mr. John S. Skinner, of Albany, is cataloguing and preparing for sale a recently purchased collection of manuscripts relating to early New York history, which had been stored for a century in an old residence at Scotia, New York. It numbers about 20,000 items and will throw much light on the history of Albany, Schenectady, and all the Mohawk country. Among the manuscripts already catalogued are: a diary of Lieutenant William Colbraith, kept during the siege of Fort Stanwix; muster-rolls of the French and Indian wars, minute-book of the Albany Sons of Liberty, letters of Sir William Johnson, papers of the colonial governors, military commissions, etc.

Nicholas Bayard's *Narrative of an Attempt made by the French of Canada upon the Mohaques Country* has been reprinted in facsimile from the only known copy—that printed by Bradford in 1693—with an introduction by Miss A. R. Hasse (Dodd, Mead, and Company).

Volume VI. of the *Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society* is composed of three main divisions: the first contains a group of papers by Henry R. Howland, relating for the most part to the early history of the Buffalo region; the second part is made up of some twelve documents—journals, letters, etc.—relating to early mission-work, 1797-1848, on the Niagara frontier and Buffalo Creek; while the third division contains "The Life of Horatio Jones", from a manuscript prepared by the late George H. Harris. An important appendix is a list of "Pamphlets and Books Printed in Buffalo prior to 1850", in continuation of the society's projected "Bibliography of the Niagara Region".

Under the title *Records of Fort Sullivan*, the Tioga Point Historical Society has published a compilation by Mrs. Louise Welles Murray, of the Fort Sullivan order-book, and extracts from journals of soldiers in General Sullivan's army, relating to Fort Sullivan in 1779.

The minutes of the Common Council of New York from 1674 to 1776 are to be published by the city of New York, under the editorship of Professor Osgood and Austin B. Keep.

The original rough minutes of the Common Council, 1809-1831, and of the Board of Aldermen, 1831-1847, of the city of New York were recently unearthed in the shop of a bookseller who had bought them from a junk-dealer. The records fill over sixty volumes and have been missing for a long time.

The frontispiece of *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for January, 1904, is a facsimile of Penn's "Proposals for a Second Settlement in the Province of Pennsylvania". Four letters of Christopher Marshall to Peter Miller, of Ephrata, 1773-1777, are printed, and under the title "The Furniture of Our Ancestors" is reprinted the first instalment from Benjamin Lehman's catalogue and price-list of cabinetware, 1786. Among the Notes and Queries are some interesting letters, including one by Joseph Hunter, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 1768, relating to Indian depredations, and one by Lieutenant-colonel Israel Shreve, Second New Jersey Infantry, 1776, relating to affairs at Mount Independence, opposite Ticonderoga.

The Historical Society of Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, has just published as Volume I., Part I., of its *Transactions*, an *Abstract of the Minutes* of the society from its organization in May, 1869, to April, 1903.

Professor St. George Leakin Sioussat has recently brought out *The English Statutes in Maryland* (J. H. U. Studies, Series XXI., Nos. 11-12). It is devoted to a study of the controversy during the years 1722-1732 over the extension to Maryland of acts of the English Parliament and forms a sequel to his former monograph on *Economics and Politics in Maryland, 1720-1750*.

"A Frenchman's Impressions of Maryland and Virginia in 1791" is the title of an elaborate account by Bernard G. Steiner of Citoyen Ferdinand Marie Bayard's narrative of his travels in 1791 (*Sewanee Review*, January).

A new and revised edition of Frederick Law Olmsted's *A Journey Through the Seaboard Slave States* is announced by Putnams.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for January, 1904, contains some important documents: the publication of "Moravian Diaries of Travels Through Virginia" is continued with the "Report and Observations of Bro. Gottschalk on his journey through Virginia and Maryland, Undertaken in March and April, 1748"; the "Orderly Book and Journal of James Newell" during the Point Pleasant campaign of 1774, copied from the original in the Draper Collection, is printed, as are also a first instalment of the "Vestry Book of King William Parish" containing the proceedings of the vestry from December 20, 1707, to June 30, 1711, and extracts from the Virginia Council and General Court Records, 1640-1641. This number also contains the first part of an authoritative article on "The Site of old 'James Towne', 1607-1698", by Samuel H. Yonge, of the United States Engineer Department, who directed the work in 1900 and 1901 of protecting Jamestown Island from the encroachments of the James River. Further information relating to Jamestown is contained in an article on "Jamestown and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities".

The records of the London Company in Virginia are being edited by Miss Susan M. Kingsbury and will be published by the Library of Congress in an edition of two octavo volumes.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has reprinted from its *Proceedings* for October, 1903, a series of letters relating to *The Federal Constitution in Virginia, 1787-1788*, collected from the archives of the State Department by Worthington C. Ford. The letters present an interesting view of the intricate political problems which had to be solved in the transition from a confederation to a federal union, and reveal the opinions of the lesser leaders in Virginia, thus reflecting the varied local feelings in that state.

Professor Walter L. Fleming is editing *West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction*, a series of reprints in pamphlet form of "documents illustrating the peculiar conditions, social, political, and economic, that prevailed in the Southern States during Reconstruction". No. 1, for January, 1904, is *The Constitution and the Ritual of The Knights of the White Camelia*.

The South Atlantic Quarterly for January, 1904, contains an article by Ulrich B. Phillips on "Conservatism and Progress in the Cotton Belt", in which he discusses the historic and economic causes of present conditions.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for January contains a collection of "Documents concerning Rev. Samuel

Thomas, 1702-1707", selected from the records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The originals are in the Public Record Office. Thomas was the first missionary of the society to South Carolina, and the documents throw some light on the local history of that colony.

The William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine for January, 1904, contains three letters from the correspondence of President Tyler. The first is from James Iredell, December 10, 1841, complimenting Tyler on his message of December 7; the second is from Tyler to John Nelson, June 28, 1843, offering him the office of attorney-general; the third, dated August 28, 1843, is to Waddy Thompson and is marked "confidential". It states that Tyler has information to the effect that Great Britain is acting as mediator in the existing negotiations between Mexico and Texas, upon the basis of the abolition of slavery, and urges the necessity of preventing Texas from accepting such mediation. Selections from the correspondence of Judge N. B. Tucker are continued from the October number and include an interesting letter from A. P. Upshur, of September 16, 1841, regarding his acceptance of the Navy portfolio, and letters from William C. Preston, John B. Christian, and Waddy Thompson, 1840-1842, relating to the political situation, relations with Mexico, etc.

The Gulf States Historical Magazine for November, 1903, contains several articles of some importance. "Some Account of Confederate Indian Affairs", by Sutton S. Scott, who was Confederate Commissioner of Indian Affairs, is an interesting contribution to the history of the Confederacy. Walter L. Fleming contributes an examination of "The Ku Klux Testimony Relating to Alabama". Under the title "Alabama and Territorial Expansion Before 1860", William O. Scroggs gives an account of the part played by Alabama in the filibustering movements against Texas, Cuba, and Nicaragua. Other articles are "Early Missions of the South (Florida)", by Anne Bozeman Lyon (presumably the missions of Louisiana and Alabama are to be treated in following numbers); "Historical Notes of Milledgeville, Georgia", by Ulrich B. Phillips; a list of "Early Newspaper Files in the Library of Emory College, Georgia", covering most of the period 1798-1862; and a first instalment of the "Contents of the *South Carolina Gazette*", covering the files of that paper for January and February, 1732, compiled by A. S. Salley, Jr., from the files in the Charleston Library Society and elsewhere. The documents printed in this number comprise eight letters, 1794-1803, to William Dickson, an Irish emigrant to Tennessee, from his parents and friends in Ireland.

The second annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Historical Society, was held in Huntsville, Alabama, on January 12. Two papers were read: "Notes of the Settlement and History of Lawrence County", by Thomas M. Owen, and "A Narrative of the Establishment by the Legislature of Georgia, in 1784, of a County in the Great Bend of the

Tennessee River", by O. D. Street. Some documents relating to Morgan county in 1818 were presented by Mr. Owen and will be printed in the proceedings.

Volume VII. of the *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, edited by Franklin L. Riley, is a bulky book of over 500 pages. Many of the articles are of the reminiscent type, but there is some material in the volume of value to the student of Mississippi history. Among the articles may be mentioned "A Mississippi Brigade in the Last Days of the Confederacy", by J. S. McNeilly, based on recollections as modified and corrected by the *Official Records*; "Yazoo County in the Civil War" and "Reconstruction in Yazoo County", by Judge Robert Bowman; "Johnson's Division in the Battle of Franklin", by General Stephen D. Lee; "Life of Colonel J. F. H. Claiborne", by Franklin L. Riley; "Senatorial Career of J. Z. George", by J. W. Garner; "Recollections of Reconstruction in East and Southeast Mississippi", by Captain W. H. Hardy; "The Chroniclers of De Soto's Expedition", by Professor T. H. Lewis; and "British West Florida", by Peter J. Hamilton.

The seventh annual meeting of the Mississippi Historical Society was held on January 7 and 8 in Jackson, Mississippi. Among the papers read were "The Mississippi-Louisiana Boundary Dispute", by Monroe McClurg; "The Choctaw Land Fraud", by Dr. Franklin L. Riley; "Story of the Treaty of Fort Confederation", by H. S. Halbert; "Reconstruction in Monroe County", by George J. Leftwich; "Reconstruction in Rankin County", by G. G. Hurst; and "Recollections of the Prison Life of Jefferson Davis and C. C. Clay", by Lemuel Shipman.

Professor Alc  e Fortier's four-volume *History of Louisiana* has just been published. The first two volumes cover the period 1512-1803, while the third and fourth bring the narrative to 1903.

State Papers and Correspondence bearing upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana (Ho. Doc. 431, 57 Cong., 2 Sess.) is a document of 289 pages covering the period from March, 1801, to May, 1804.

Documents relating to the Purchase and Exploration of Louisiana is the title of a volume announced by Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. It will contain "The Limits and Bounds of Louisiana", by Thomas Jefferson, and "The Exploration of the Red, the Black, and the Washita Rivers", by William Dunbar.

The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association for January, 1904, contains an article by W. J. Spillman on the "Adjustment of the Texas Boundary in 1850", and a very valuable account by Herbert Eugene Bolton of "Some materials for Southwestern History in the Archivo General de Mexico". The documents described relate primarily to Texas, and a brief inventory is appended. George F. Fuller's "Sketch of the Texas Navy" is reminiscent rather than historical.

The American Historical Magazine and Tennessee Historical Quarterly for January, 1904, contains two letters from R. G. Dunlap to Presi-

dent Jackson and two long letters in reply from the President, of June-August, 1831. They relate to troubles in the cabinet, particularly to Major Eaton and to the position of Major Lewis in the President's household, and contain much denunciation of Calhoun.

Of most general interest in *The "Old Northwest" Genealogical Quarterly* for January, 1904, is an article on "The First Settlement of Plain Township, Franklin County, Ohio", by H. Warren Phelps.

The *Ohio Archeological and Historical Quarterly* for January, 1904, contains biographical sketches of Simon Kenton, the Kentucky pioneer, by R. W. M'Farland, and of John Brough, governor of Ohio in 1864-1865, by Osman C. Hooper; a sketch of the beginnings of "Historic Worthington", by Mira C. Parsons; a list, by Jean D. Cheetham, of the governors of Ohio, 1803-1903, and the "History of Fort Hamilton", by W. C. Miller. In this number are also to be found the "Proceedings of the Society" since June, 1903, with an interesting account of recent gifts of manuscripts, including the archives of the Shaker communities of North Union and Watervliet. These last are contained in about one hundred bound volumes and include many diaries, ledgers, "Revelations", "Instructions", etc., covering the years 1824-1892.

Under the title of *Ohio Centennial Anniversary Celebration* (Columbus, 1903), the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society has published the proceedings of the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Ohio as a state, held at Chillicothe, May 20-21, 1903. The addresses and papers are of a popular character and cover the different phases of Ohio history to the present time.

The Government of Illinois, by Evarts B. Greene, and *The Government of Indiana*, by Ellwood W. Kemp, are two forthcoming volumes in the "Handbooks of American Government" series (Macmillan).

The most important article in *The Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for January, 1904, is by Charles Oscar Paullin, on "The First Elections under the Constitution". "Some Iowa Mounds, an Anthropological Survey", by Duren J. H. Ward, is a surveyor's description of the mounds, interspersed with interesting suggestions. "Shelby County — a Sociological Study", by John J. Louis, the first part of which appears in this number, contains, in spite of its title, some suggestive information of general character.

The January, 1904, number of *Annals of Iowa* contains "A Reminiscence of the Last Battle of the Red River Expedition", by William G. Donnan, which is principally devoted to an explanation of Colonel Shaw's disobedience of orders in the battle of Yellow Bayou; a biographical sketch of Father Mazzuchelli, an Iowa pioneer; an article on "Iowa in the Territory of Missouri", by William Salter; and "Block-Houses in the Civil War", by Major-general G. M. Dodge.

The State Historical Society of Iowa is compiling for publication a bibliography of Iowa public documents.

Miss Mary R. Whitcomb, of the Historical Department at Des Moines, is at work on an index to early files of Iowa newspapers.

A complete and definitive edition of the *Journals of Lewis and Clark*, under the editorship of R. G. Thwaites, is announced by Dodd, Mead, and Company. A more detailed account of the material to be included in this first complete edition is to be found on page 441 of this issue.

The Arthur H. Clark Company announce a thirty-one volume series of annotated reprints of works relating to early western travels, 1748-1846, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites. Many of the originals from which the reprints are to be made are very rare. Volume XXXI. will contain a complete analytical index to the entire series.

A. S. Barnes and Company have reprinted Haskel's 1820 edition of *Harmon's Journal*, with an introduction by Robert Waite. The volume is one of a series of similar reprints called "The Trail Makers", for which Professor J. B. McMaster is consulting editor.

The volume on *Oregon* in the "American Commonwealths" series has been withdrawn, and its place is to be taken by one which Professor F. H. Hodder has been engaged to write.

Professor Leo S. Rowe, who was chairman of the commission to revise and compile the laws of Porto Rico, has in preparation a volume with the title *The United States and Porto Rico*, which will deal with the problems of administration in that island.

A Canadian Bibliography for the Year 1901, compiled by Lawrence J. Burpee, is reprinted in pamphlet form from the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada by James Hope and Son, Ottawa. Contributions to periodicals are included and the entire work is carefully indexed.

As was to be expected, Panama and its relations with the United States are receiving much attention both in this country and abroad. Among the more important articles on the subject may be noted: *The Recognition of Panama and its Results*, by Theodore S. Woolsey, (Green Bag, December); *The Isthmian Question*, by Thomas D. Herran (Independent, January 14); *Legal Aspects of the Panama Situation*, by Edwin Maxey (Yale Law Review, December); *The Secession of Panama*, by Benjamin Taylor (Fortnightly Review, January); and *La Politique des États-Unis dans l'Amérique Centrale*, by J. Franconie (Questions diplomatiques et coloniales, January).

The Colonization of South America, by E. J. Payne, is announced for the "Cambridge Historical Series" (Macmillan). Other publications to be noted by the student of Spanish-American history are: *La Ciudad de Mexico*, by J. M. Marroqui (Blake and Fiske, Mexico), a three-volume historical and descriptive work on the City of Mexico; and *Anales diplomáticos y consulares de Colombia*, by A. José Uribe. "Un Arrêt de la Cour Suprême de la République Argentine" is the title of an article by A. Esmein, in the *Revue Politique et Parlementaire* for January 10.

Noteworthy reviews of books: *Cambridge Modern History. Volume VII., The United States*, by F. H. Hodder (Dial, February 1); A. B. Hart's *Actual Government*, by J. W. Garner (Annals of the American Academy, January); by Allen Johnson (Yale Review, February); R. L. Ashley's *American Government*, by C. H. d'E. Leppington (Economic Review, January); Trevelyan's *American Revolution*, Part II., by Frederic Harrison (Independent Review, February), (Contemporary Review, January), (Independent, January 14), by C. H. Van Tyne (Annals of the American Academy, March); A. B. Hepburn's *History of Coinage and Currency in the United States*, by L. R. Strangeways (Economic Review, January); Edward Stanwood's *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century*, by J. E. Conner (Annals of the American Academy, March); Catterall's *Second Bank of the United States*, by J. A. Doyle (English Historical Review, January); W. F. Johnson's *A Century of Expansion*, by Frederic Austin Ogg (Dial, January 16); Guy Carleton Lee's *True History of the Civil War*, (Independent, February 11); A. G. Bradley's *Canada in the Twentieth Century*, (Nation, February 18); Soley's *Porter*, by H. C. Gauss (United States Service, February); Edith Armstrong Talbot's *Samuel Chapman Armstrong*, by Percy F. Bicknell (Dial, March 1); Lyman Abbott's *Henry Ward Beecher*, by Mary Eleanor Barrows (Dial, January 16); Senator Hoar's *Autobiography of Seventy Years* (Nation, February 4); *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, Volumes I to X., by Paul S. Reinsch (Dial, March 16).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Gilbert O. Bent, *The Latours in Massachusetts Bay, 1640-1646*; Jonas Howe, *The Royal Emigrants, Nova Scotian troops during the Revolution* (Acadiensis, January); T. R. White, *Constitutional Provisions Guaranteeing Freedom of the Press in Pennsylvania* (American Law Register, January); John Goode, *The Electoral Commission of 1877*; Blackburne Esterline, *Acts of Congress Declared Unconstitutional by the Supreme Court*; J. O. Pierce, *James Wilson as a Jurist* (American Law Review, January); Henry Villard, *Recollections of Lincoln* (February); Jesse B. Carter, *Theodor Mommsen*; Rollo Ogden, *Prescott the Man* (Atlantic, March); F. C. Wade, *Some Comments on the Alaskan Award* (February); A. G. Bradley, *The Fight for North America* (in twelve parts through the year, Canadian Magazine); George V. Smith, *The First Theocratic Government in the New World*, Davenport's Colony of New Haven (Connecticut Magazine, December); Dorothea Nath, *German American Records*, an account of Germans in America compiled from *Niles's Register* (German American Annals, February); E. L. Didier, *Patrick Henry as a Lawyer* (Green Bag, January); J. G. Johnson, *A Neglected Chapter of our Colonial History*, the siege of Louisburg, 1745; J. B. Moore, *Beginnings of American Diplomacy* (Harper's Magazine, January and March); W. G. Brown, *George Washington, Southerner* (Independent, February 18); C. H. Lincoln, *Naval Manuscripts in National Archives* (Literary Col-

lector, January): *Columbus and the Discovery of Northmen in North America* (Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete des Seewesens, January): John W. Foster, *The Alaskan Boundary Tribunal*, with text of decision and map (National Geographic Magazine, January): F. A. Ogg, *Paper Money in the New England Colonies* (New England Magazine, February): J. A. LeRoy, *The Friars in the Philippines* (Political Science Quarterly, December): Harry A. Fiedler, *Das Bevölkerungsproblem in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Preussische Jahrbücher, February): Gabriel Louis Jaray, *L'arbitrage international et la politique Américaine* (Questions diplomatiques et coloniales, January 1 and 16): Dr. Latouche-Tréville, *Les vrais Découvreurs de l'Amérique* (La Revue, January): C. H. Huberich, *La Législation aux États-Unis en 1902* (Revue du droit public, September): François Monod, *L'Institut Carnegie de Washington et ses Origines Historiques* (Revue internationale de l'enseignement, November 15): Captain A. T. Mahan, *The War of 1812* (beginning in the January number); *Mrs. George Bancroft's Letters from England in 1846-49* (Scribner's Magazine, February, March, and April): R. G. Thwaites, *The Great River*, historical sketches of the Mississippi (running in *The World Today*): John B. Phillips, *Recent State Constitution Making* (Yale Review, February).

